1962

Predicting enrollments and the need for additional campuses in a Fresno regional junior college district

William Frank Hanson
University of the Pacific

PREDICTING ENROLLMENTS AND THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL CAMPUSES IN A FRESNO REGIONAL JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the School of Education

The University of Pacific

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

---

by

William Frank Hanson

August 1962

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM: ITS BACKGROUND AND TERMINOLOGY

California junior college educators have long sought a solution to the dilemma created by the attendance of students from school districts which are not within a junior college district. The difficulties of attendance billing, transportation, and student procurement to mention a few, have long been perplexing problems for many junior colleges in the state of California.

The passage of Assembly Bill 608, which made it the policy of the legislature to have every high school district a part of a junior college district by 1964,[1] was the culmination of a decade of California junior college progression, unparalleled in higher education history.

Junior college district studies for many proposed junior college districts in California are presently being conducted by county re-districting committees and by the State Department of Education.

The proposed Fresno regional junior college district, which this study encompasses, has long been a plan of many junior college educators in the Fresno area. This geographical area of study includes eighteen high school

---

[1] California Statutes, 1961, Ch. 1077, p. 2809.

districts located in five different counties in the central section of the San Joaquin Valley. All of the elementary and high school districts of Fresno and Madera counties (excluding Coalinga, Riverdale and Tranquillity High School Districts, and the elementary districts within their boundaries) are included in this study. In addition, the study includes that portion of the Dos Palos High School District situated within Merced county, the Hardwick Elementary School District in Kings county, the Traver, Windsor, and Kings River Elementary Districts, and the Dinuba High School District all of which are located in the northern portion of Tulare county. Most of the pupils in this area are concentrated in communities near the 99 Highway which runs through the middle of the proposed district.[2]

For many years this area has been served by two of the oldest junior colleges in California, the Fresno City College established in 1910 and the Reedley College established in 1926.

---

[2]California State Department of Education, A Preliminary Survey of Proposed Junior College Districts to be Composed of Twenty-Two High School Districts in Kings, Madera, Fresno and Tulare Counties. (Sacramento: State Department of Education, Mimeographed Copy, 1962), p. 2.

Both of these colleges have been governed by high school boards and the district territories of both colleges are limited to the boundaries of their respective high school districts.

The Reedley College, which is located in the south-eastern portion of the proposed district, moved to its present location in 1956. This location of one hundred fifty-seven acres bordering the Kings River guarantees the college adequate room for expansion for many years. Although operated on the lowest assessed valuation of any junior college in California, Reedley College has a larger enrollment than twenty-one other junior colleges in California. Over 70 per cent of its student body is composed of out-of-district students, and all but 17 per cent of its support comes from the state equalization program and the out-of-district junior college tuition tax.[3]

Fresno City College, formerly known as Fresno Junior College, which is located in the center of the proposed district, was operated for many years as the lower division of the Fresno State College. Following recommendations made by George D. Strayer in a survey conducted in 1948,

---

[3]Reedley College Board of Trustees, Reedley College Annual Report 1959-60 (Reedley: Reedley College Board of Trustees, 1960), p. 1.

Fresno City College separated from Fresno State College and has operated as a separate entity under the Fresno Unified School System.[4] Since the day of the separation Fresno City College has had a steady increase in enrollments. Full-time enrollments as of October, 1961, were 2,125 students.

Both Fresno and Reedley Colleges, since their early conceptions, have served students from outside of their present high school districts. Reedley has run an extensive bus system to surrounding high school districts for many years. This practice has also been used on a limited basis by Fresno City College.

The Madera area composed of Chowchilla, Madera and Dos Palos high school districts poses a difficult situation because of its remoteness. This area was designated as needing a junior college by the Master Plan. It includes many isolated elementary districts in the mountainous region to the east as well as Dos Palos, which is a considerable distance to the west. These population groupings create a problem of commuting.

A request for a survey by the State Department of

---

[4]Fresno City College, Application for Accreditation (Fresno: Fresno City College Faculty, 1962), p. 3.

Education was made by the Fresno County Committee on School District Organization and the governing boards of the twenty-two high schools in this study. A preliminary draft was submitted to the county committee in 1962. In the draft, overall student enrollment predictions were made up to and including 1968.

It might be noted that the survey did not include predictions of junior college attendance from any individual high school district, the location of future junior college sites within the proposed districts, limits of enrollments for Reedley College and Fresno City College, or factors influencing junior college attendance.

I. THE PROBLEM

It is the purpose of this study (1) to explore the factors which influence junior college attendance, (2) to predict the junior college enrollments for the study area, by year, from 1963 to 1980, (3) to predict the enrollment for the three individual attendance areas, by year, from 1963 to 1980, and (4) to propose the date of establishment and the general locations of additional junior colleges.

Importance of the study. The increase of college enrollments far beyond expectation has created perplexing

questions. To insure adequate college educational opportunities for the 1980's careful planning must be started in the 60's. It is hoped that this study will give valuable assistance to junior college administrators, county committees on school district organization, and high school principals of this area in planning for future enrollments.

Limitations of the study. This study was primarily concerned with future junior college enrollments in the study area and the factors that influence these enrollments. Of secondary concern was the future location of junior college sites as influenced by student population or area needs.

Scope of study. Of major importance in this study was a survey and enrollment review of all the elementary and high schools in the proposed junior college district. In addition to this primary factor an investigation of future population and growth patterns in Fresno and Madera counties was made.

II. DEFINITION OF TERMS

A precise understanding of terms is important to the reader. The following expressions have been used in this study with the indicated connotations.

Study area. This designation includes the following high school districts in Fresno county: Caruthers, Central, Clovis, Fowler, Fresno City Unified, Kerman, Kingsburg, Laton, Parlier, Reedley, Sanger, Selma, Sierra, and Washington; the following in Madera county: Chowchilla and Madera; the following in Merced county: Dos Palos; and the following in Tulare county: Dinuba.

Fresno Regional Junior College. This is a title used by the State Department of Education in its preliminary survey of the proposed junior college district; it applies to all the high school districts enumerated in the definition of the term study area.

Junior college, community junior college. These terms refer to the thirteenth and fourteenth grades.

Fresno attendance area. This area includes one-half of Sanger, Fowler, and Sierra Union High School districts and all of Kerman, Central, Clovis, Fresno Unified and Washington Union High School districts.

Reedley attendance area. This description applies to one-half of Sanger, Fowler, and Sierra Union High School districts. It applies to all of the Caruthers, Kingsburg, Laton, Parlier, Reedley and Dinuba High School districts.

Madera attendance area. This area includes all of the Chowchilla, Madera and Dos Palos High School districts.

Full-time student. This expression designates any student, day or evening, carrying twelve or more units of college work.

Present status projection. This designation describes a method used to predict junior college enrollments for the Fresno Regional Study Area based on grade projection ratios derived from attendance records for the past seven years and State Department of Education ratios for grades thirteen and fourteen for this area.

Status quo projections. These projections were used by the Master Plan Survey Team and were based on the assumption that for every one hundred full-time students enrolled in public junior colleges in California in 1958 there will be two hundred seventy-six students enrolled in 1975.

Modified projection. This projection was used by the Master Plan Survey Team; it was based on the assumption that for every one hundred full-time students enrolled in public junior colleges in California in 1958 there will be three hundred twenty-four students enrolled in 1975.

III. BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

The following assumptions were necessary to conduct this study: (1) the movement of students through the various grade levels will tend to follow the basic pattern of the past seven years; (2) the increase in net immigration will continue at a level established during the past ten years; (3) a slight increase will be expected in the proportion of high school students attending junior college; (4) standards of admission to California public junior colleges will not be changed materially in the near future; (5) the recommendation of the Master Plan will effect an increased junior college enrollment (in addition to the increase in (3) supra) up to and including 1975 and (6) the future desirability and value of a college education will increase.

IV. PROCEDURES

Grade progression ratio method. The procedures followed in this study were designed to determine junior college enrollments and additional junior college establishments in the study area from 1963 to 1980.

This procedure involved the use of the grade projection method, which determines future enrollments in higher grades by establishing a ratio of students who will

pass from one grade to the next. Projections were made individually for all eighteen of the high schools in the study area from 1963 to 1980.

Totals were then compiled by year for the entire area as well as for the individual Fresno, Reedley and Madera attendance areas.

Percentage of enrollment method. Also projected by year were the status quo projections and the modified projections. The percentage increase by year of each projection was multiplied by the 1958 enrollments of Reedley College and Fresno City College. A hypothetical enrollment was established for the Madera area by applying the state ratio of students continuing on to junior college from Madera, Chowchilla and Dos Palos high schools.

By analyzing the three projections, the investigator made the summary, conclusions, and recommendations by applying the maximum, optimum, and minimum standards of enrollments for junior colleges to the three attendance area projections.

Sources of data. A review of the standard recommended works on junior college education was made. A survey of all existing reports of junior college district organization and junior college student population

prediction studies was undertaken. This review included both the State Department of Education surveys and surveys made by private organizations. In addition to these reports, comprehensive data were secured from the following:

1. Fresno and Madera County Planning Commissions reports and estimates of population growth for the next twenty years.
2. Fresno, Madera, Merced, Kings and Tulare County Schools' official attendance reports.

V. ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS

Chapter II gives a brief history of the junior college, a review of its aims and functions, an examination of the literature predicting enrollments in higher education, a summary of the legislation affecting the junior college and an explanation of the Master Plan for Higher Education and its influence on the junior college.

Chapter III gives an analysis of the factors governing junior college enrollments. They are the proximity of the junior college to the student factor, the increased demand for college education factor, the socio-economic factor, and the mental ability factor.

Chapter IV contains a description of population expansion in California, the predicted population growth

in the study area, the grade progression ratios of the eighteen high schools in the study area, and the statistical analysis applied to the grade progression ratio study.

Chapter V gives a recapitulation of the study, a summary of its findings, the conclusions drawn from these findings, and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE IN CALIFORNIA

I. THE HISTORY OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

The growth of the junior college movement has been phenomenal and its evolution is difficult to explain in view of the traditional concept of the university. Unlike the great universities of Europe and the classical universities of the United States, the junior college progressed to its present status in sixty years. To understand this growth is to understand the democratic heritage of America. The American dream encompasses the beliefs that education is for the good of the individual and society and that public education is the responsibility of the state.

The first president of the University of Chicago, William Raney Harper, is credited with being the "father" of the two-year college. The term junior college was initially used in 1896 to designate the first two years of college which were separated from the senior college at the university. It was through Dr. Harper's influence that the first independent institution was created at Joliet, Illinois. Previous to this establishment, President Tappan at the University of Michigan and President Folwell at the University of Minnesota had voiced the need for the junior

college and its unique functions. Educators, becoming familiar with the junior college concept, soon found that it was the solution to the void developing in higher education. Because of the great number of students seeking a college education, an answer to the dilemma had to be found; the answer was the two-year college.[1]

Presently over 800,000 students are enrolled in more than six hundred junior colleges throughout the nation. It is a tribute to California's progressiveness that over 240,000 students in the state are presently enrolled in seventy junior colleges. Once an experiment, the actuality of the junior college entity is permanently established. It is significant that the junior college development in California flourished as the state's population and industrial community expanded. This parallel is so closely related to the economic and sociological advancements which California has made that Dr. Roy Simpson, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, stated, some years ago, that all high schools in the state of California should be in a junior college district.[2]

---

[1]Walter Crosby Eells, The Junior College. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1931), p. 45.

[2]Roy E. Simpson, The Future of the Junior College. (Yosemite National Park: An Address before the California Junior College Association, 1956).

In 1959, the California legislature, becoming cognizant that California's population would double by 1980 and that California would have over one million college students by 1970, laid the groundwork for far-reaching legislation. They adopted Assembly Concurrent Resolution Number 88, which authorized the preparation of the Master Plan for Higher Education to meet the needs of the state during the next ten years and thereafter. The Master Plan included the junior college as a tri-partite member of higher education in California.[3] The legislature in 1961, recognizing recommendations of the Master Plan, made it the policy of the legislature, by passing Assembly Bill Number 608, that all high schools and unified districts in the state of California be included in a junior college district.[4]

To understand the growth and role of the two-year college in California, a review of the function of the junior college is necessary.

---

[3]Liaison Committee of the State Board of Education and the Regents of the University of California, A Master Plan for Higher Education in California 1960-1975 (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1960), p.1.

[4]California Statutes, 1961, Ch. 1077, p. 2809.

II. FUNCTIONS OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

Eells, in his book, The Junior College, referred to the development of the junior college as having movement and being youthful and vigorous.[5] The vitality of this progression has continued unabated since this description in 1931.

The development of the junior college has been elsewhere described as a movement. Such a description denotes a sociological change within our society indicating that it has been not the work of one man or one institution, or one decade, but rather, that it has been a gradual creation of an American policy of higher education to meet the needs of a rapidly changing order in which much of the traditional and prevailing educational philosophy may be proved to be outgrown and inadequate. It should never be final or static, but should grow as does a science or an art.[6]

One of the first systematic efforts to determine and state the functions of the junior college was made by F. W. Thomas, former president of Fresno State College; it was

---

[5]Eells, op. cit., pp. 7-9.

[6]Carl E. Seashore, The Junior College Movement (New York: Henry Holt Company, 1940), p. 149.

written in a doctoral dissertation at Stanford University in 1926. Four functions were listed which have been widely accepted. They were the popularizing function, preparatory function, terminal function, and the guidance function. Adult education, as one of the five functions, was listed at a much later date.[7]

To observe the functions and purposes of the junior college, one has only to view the California system. The California Association of Junior Colleges has stated its standards and aims to be the following:

1. The junior college is committed to the democratic way of life.
2. The junior college recognizes the individual man as the highest value of the world and the universe.
3. The junior college is committed to the policy of granting to the individual man the maximum amount of freedom, personal initiative, and adventure consistent with equal opportunities on the part of his fellows.
4. The junior college is committed to the policy of providing for all the children of all the people, post high school education which will meet their needs. This includes the training of adults as well as youths.[8]

In accordance with this statement of basic principles,

---

[7]William M. Proctor, The Junior College, Its Organization and Administration (Stanford University: Stanford University Press, 1927), p. 5.

[8]Monroe E. Deutsch, Aubrey A. Douglas and George D. Strayer, A Report of a Survey of the Needs of California in Higher Education (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1948), p. 5.

junior colleges have six specific purposes or objectives. They are as follows:

1. Terminal education--a complete training should be given to those students who will finish their period of formal education in the junior college....designed to achieve occupational competency, civic competency, and personal adequacy.
2. General education--every junior college student should be given that training which will prepare him to function effectively as a member of a family, a community, a state, a nation, and a world.
3. Orientation and guidance--it is a specific responsibility of every junior college to assist its students to "find themselves." A program of training and guidance should be provided so that every student may discover his aptitudes, choose a life work, and prepare for the successful pursuit of such work.
4. Lower division training--each junior college should provide lower division of the first two years of senior college work for the limited number of students who plan transferring to a university after completing two years in junior college. This training should be broad enough to include the lower division requirements in the liberal arts, scientific, engineering, and professional fields.
5. Adult education--every junior college should cooperate with other public education institutions in providing instruction to meet the needs of adults living in the region. The program of training should include cultural and vocational education.
6. Removal of matriculation deficiencies--junior colleges should provide opportunity for students who fail to meet entrance requirements to some university to remove such deficiencies, and thus to qualify for admission in the higher institution of their choice.[9]

---

[9] Ibid., p. 6.

Preparatory function. By tradition the first responsibility of the two-year college is that of preparation for advanced study wherein high school graduates take the first two years of college training in their own communities. This is the function that Folwell, Tappan, and Harper had in mind when they proposed the transfer of their lower division to the secondary school.[10]

In California, David Starr Jordan, first President of Stanford University, expressed his approval of the junior college movement and thus lent the support of a great university to the cause of junior college education, when he made the following statement:

> I am looking forward, as you know, to the time when the large high schools of the state, in conjunction with the small colleges, will relieve the two great universities from the expense and from the necessity of giving instruction of the first two university years. Instruction of these years is of necessity, elementary, and of the same general nature as the work of the high school itself. It is not desirable for a university to have more than 2,000 students gathered together in one place, and when the number comes to exceed that figure, then some division is desirable. The only reasonable division is that which will take away students who do not need libraries or laboratories for their work.[11]

Dr. Roy E. Simpson, State Superintendent of Public

---

[10] Bells, op. cit., pp. 45-47.

[11] Proctor, op. cit., pp. 7-8.

Instruction, perhaps best explained the role the junior college has played in preparing students for the university in a speech describing the record of the junior college transfers at the University of California:

> Over the five year period 1951-1955, the junior college graduated more than 50,000 students, of whom almost a quarter (24.51%) transferred to the University of California at Berkeley, Davis, Los Angeles, Riverside, or Santa Barbara. A study of the performance of junior college transfers during their junior year at Berkeley in the fall of 1951 has been prepared by the Office of Relations with Schools. Comparison was made between the persistence and achievement of junior college transfers and native students likewise entering their junior year in 1951. Junior college transfers who at the time they enrolled in junior college would have been eligible for admission to the University of California, completed their fourth or senior year at Berkeley in the same proportion (77.9%) as students who had in 1951 entered the university as freshmen. They even had a slightly higher grade point average overall (1.80 as compared with 1.73 for native students). Clearly the junior college as a whole provided satisfactory preparation for upper division studies and does as good a job as the university in the instance of students whose high school preparation met university requirements for admission.[12]

Vocational and semi-professional function. California has been fortunate that such outstanding leaders as Dr. Alex F. Lange, for many years Dean of the School of Education at the University of California, and Dr. David Starr Jordan, of

---

[12]Simpson, op. cit., (an address).

Stanford University, urged the development of the junior college.

Alex Frederick Lange was one of the key men in the growth of the University of California. His thoughts and influences reached far beyond the university and inspired school men everywhere to improve secondary education in California. In his essays and speeches Dean Lange developed the concept of an integrated public educational system from the elementary school through the junior college. The basic theory of the terminal vocational nature of the junior college was advanced by him in his classes and in his speeches. He sketched the blueprint of junior college philosophy, not only for California but for the nation.[13]

Dr. Lange, in recognizing the need for vocational and semi-professional workers in California, realized that the state's economic growth would parallel its ability to train skilled workers. The consistent increase in enrollment in California junior college vocational classes has been a tribute to his prophecy. The terminal program offerings in the community college are varied and reflect community needs. In a study in 1950-51, 212 different

---

[13]Jessie Parker Bogue, The Community College (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1950), pp. 334-335.

curriculums offered by California junior colleges were found to be strictly vocational in nature and designed to prepare the student to earn a living within his community.[14]

The vocational education staff of the California State Department of Education has described vocational terminal education in the following way:

> In a democracy all are workers. All have the right and duty in sharing the work that is to be done. Vocational education is our way of preparing each to find and to do his work. In a world of growing interdependence, of expanding goods and services, and of an ever increasing standard of living, occupations grow more and more specialized. Independent, home-centered production becomes less and less significant. Opportunities for the child to learn by watching and working with his father become fewer and fewer. Society must develop an organized, systematic way of aiding each individual to find a satisfying vocational adjustment. Vocational education is such a way. It is for all workers and the children of all workers.[15]

General education function. General education is the "balance wheel" of the junior college curriculum. Our educational heritage warrants our expecting that certain fundamental areas of knowledge should be mastered by anyone who has compiled sixty units of college work from an

---

[14] B. Lamar Johnson, General Education in Action (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1957), p. 224.

[15] Vocational Education Staff, Vocational Education in California (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1945), p. 2.

institution of higher learning. A junior college curriculum that becomes too vocational or too specialized in one area risks the danger of producing students whose concepts are limited and whose backgrounds are narrow.

Lamar Johnson describes general education as "that education which leads to an understanding of the major fields of knowledge and the interrelationship between them."[16] It has been defined as "education for the common life" or the "non-specialized and non-vocational education which should be the heritage of all."

General education may be thought of as a storeroom of organized information available to be recalled and stand the individual in good stead when the occasion for its use occurs.

To store this knowledge adequately, the student must discipline his mind so that the discovering, organizing, and expressing of this information is academic. The skillful recall of this learning and its use thereafter either momentarily or for a lifetime, reflect his general educational background. To properly prepare the student for life's changing situations, the college curriculum makers

---

[16]Johnson, op. cit., p. 19.

must constantly up-date their general education offerings. These alterations should reflect the changes in society and set up a pattern for future living.[17]

In 1950 at a general education workshop, consisting of leaders of junior college educators in California, the following general education goals were drafted:

> Students in California public junior colleges differ greatly in experiences, needs, capacities, aspirations and interests. The general education program aims to help each student increase his competence in
>
> 1. Exercising the privileges and responsibilities of democratic citizenship.
> 2. Developing a set of sound moral and spiritual values by which he guides his life.
> 3. Expressing his thoughts clearly in speaking and writing and in reading and listening and understanding.
> 4. Using the basic mathematical and mechanical skills necessary in everyday life.
> 5. Using methods of critical thinking for the solution of problems and for the discrimination among values.
> 6. Understanding his cultural heritage so that he may gain a perspective of his time and place in the world.
> 7. Understanding his interaction with his biological and physical environment.
> 8. Maintaining good mental and physical health for himself, his family, and his community.
> 9. Developing a balanced personal and social adjustment.
> 10. Sharing in the development of a satisfactory home and family life.

---

[17] William S. Gray, The Junior College Curriculum (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929), pp.15-25.

11. Achieving a satisfactory vocational adjustment.
12. Taking part in some form of satisfying creative activity and in appreciating the creative activities of others.[18]

California junior colleges will place increased emphasis on general education making it college-wide in scope. Specific courses will be provided emphasizing general education outcomes, utilizing guidance and counseling to the fullest, designing teaching method and course content specifically for general education, using a wider variety of instructing material adapted to individual learning situations and to individual students, drawing upon all possible resources to meet community needs and to make the junior colleges effective community colleges.[19]

Guidance function. Eells states that the junior college has a unique opportunity to do a more successful piece of guidance work than the four-year college or university. The large university or college is very often plagued by overwhelming numbers making it difficult to isolate the individual and give him adequate attention. The true emphasis of the junior college is on the individual, whereas

---

[18] B. Lamar Johnson, General Education in Action (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1957), pp. 21-22.

[19] Ibid., p. 390.

the university emphasizes scholarship and subject matter. Also, the typical junior college student lives at home and many opportunities for cooperation between home and college are available which are not possible when he is at a distance from home influences and environment. For these reasons, the junior college has a unique opportunity to help the student discover his talents, problems and interests, and to direct them in ways that will help him to meet the complex social, educational and vocational adjustments which he must face in his transition from teenage to adulthood.[20]

The guidance function of classifying students on the basis of their desires and capabilities is of fundamental importance under the American system of education. The increase in numbers of students with various interests and abilities has made the differentiation of educational experiences of the utmost importance for individual needs. Experience in psychological investigation indicates that a specific educational or vocational interest is not necessarily a good index to the possession of ability in a specific field. To determine the interest with matching

---

[20]Eells, op. cit., p. 316.

ability is of great importance for social efficiency and personal happiness of the individual.

Modern guidance programs in the junior college assume (1) that all students have problems, (2) that they want help in the solution of these problems, (3) that students will wish to make final decisions and choices themselves, and (4) that counselors and other faculty members alike are able and willing to help.[21]

Individual counseling interviews with a skilled counselor constitute the most important part of any guidance program. In these interviews, a student has an opportunity to learn how to combine the general information obtained in the orientation classes with specific personal data drawn from tests, grades, and other background information.

Counselors and teachers working together can help each student to obtain the education best suited to his individual abilities and aspirations. It becomes an outstanding function of the junior college to furnish guidance which will prepare the student for a useful, satisfying and happy life.

Community service. Two years of college is needed

---

[21]Seashore, op. cit., p. 27.

today as much as a high school diploma was needed a decade ago. The responsibility of training and retraining adults has become a function of the junior college. The junior college is aware that education is a continuing process from birth to death and is a necessity in our time. The name "community college" has been applied to this institution that serves the local educational needs of the community by the President's Commission on Higher Education.[22]

The Commission, in a study of the junior colleges throughout the nation, found that they were the institutions most readily available to raise the educational level. The Commission listed five basic functions of the "community college" as follows:

> First, the community college must make frequent surveys of its community so that it can adapt its educational program to the educational needs of its full-time students. These needs are both general and vocational. Second, since the program is expected to serve a cross-section of the youth population, it is essential that consideration be given not only to apprentice training but also to cooperative procedures which provide for the older students, alternate periods of attendance at college and remunerative work. Third,

---

[22]President's Commission on Higher Education, Higher Education for American Democracy, A report of the President's Commission on Higher Education, (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1947), III, p. 5.

> the community college must prepare its students to live a rich and satisfying life, part of which involves earning a living. To this end, the total educational effort, general and vocational of any student, must be a well integrated single program, not two programs. Fourth, the community college must also meet the needs of its students who will go on to a more extended general education or to a specialized and professional study at some other college or university. Fifth, the community college must be the center for administration or comprehensive adult education programs.[23]

One of the greatest sources of the junior college strength comes from the adaptation of its curriculum to the individual and community needs. Functioning as a community service agency for education, the junior college becomes the focal point in offering art exhibits, library services, lecture series and in improving the individual through its cultural offerings in art, music, and literature.[24]

In a time in history when traditional concepts and educational attainment can become obsolete in a few short years, because of a rapidly moving technocracy and changes in social and conventional mores, continual education and adult education become an important function of an institution of higher learning. Adult education may be justified on the same fundamental reasons that justify education for

---

[23] Ibid., pp. 6-7.

[24] John S. Diekhoff, Democracy's College (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), p. 151.

any age, group or class of people.

In the spring of 1932, a special committee of seven members operating under the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching made its report. Adult education was definitely defined as one of the main functions of the junior college.[25]

Although all of the functions of the junior college are associated with the community, the adult education program most readily cements this bond. Bogue describes this community service as follows:

> The community college is in a strategic position from this standpoint of its basic philosophy, its relation to the community, its facilities either actual or potential, and by clear responsibility, to provide for adult education on a far more progressive and inclusive scale than is the case at the present time. It would seem that every college regardless of its size or method of control, should seek out and encourage adults in the community to improve themselves and their occupational status. It is not only an unusual opportunity to extend the circles of the college's cultural and training influences, but it is also a responsibility which every educational institution owes to the society which, in one way or another, makes its existence possible. Even if the college is thinking only in terms of enlightened self-interest, its services to adults can be, as they have proved to be in many communities, one of the surest and soundest ways to build strong and favorable public relations. Many of the problems now facing public school systems owing to the indifference

---

[25] Seashore, op. cit., p. 26.

of taxpayers could be resolved by services to the adults of the community.[26]

III. A REVIEW OF THE LITERARY PUBLICATIONS PREDICTING COLLEGE ENROLLMENTS IN CALIFORNIA

California for many years has been concerned about the relationships of its institutions and their functions. As early as 1899 a seventy member committee was formed to study the state's educational program. In 1919 a joint education committee of the legislature studied the state's normal schools and recommended that they become state teachers' colleges. The Council of Educational Planning and Co-ordination was authorized in 1931 to study the relations of schools in the public school system and the University of California.[27]

Since World War II four studies made in California have been instrumental in forming the present policies in higher education. They are:

1. The Strayer Report.
2. The Re-Study of the Needs of California in Higher Education.

---

[26] Bogue, op. cit., p. 229.

[27] California Master Plan, op. cit., pp. 16-17.

3. A Study of the Need for Additional Centers of Public Higher Education in California.
4. The California Master Plan for Higher Education in California in 1960-1975.

The Strayer Report. The Strayer Report was authorized by the 1947 California legislature which allocated $50,000 to be spent by the California State Department of Education and the Regents of the University of California. A committee to conduct the study was appointed by the liaison committee of the Regents of the University of California and the State Board of Education. Strayer, chairman of the committee, used the following factors in his enrollment forecast:

1. Population growth.
2. Age groups comprising the population.
3. Demands for higher education on a nation-wide basis.
4. Demand for higher education in California.
5. Distribution of college enrollments in California.
6. Professional preparation.[28]

Strayer divided the State of California into statistical areas and based his predictions on past attendance at

---

[28]Monroe E. Deutsch, Aubrey A. Douglass and George D. Strayer, A Report of a Survey of the Needs of California in Higher Education (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1948), p. 52.

college institutions, future populations to be served in each area, and the percentage of students then attending universities, state colleges and junior colleges. Strayer considered the following factors to be of the greatest importance in predicting the needs of California education:

> The needs of California for facilities in higher education must be based upon present and future college and university attendance. The estimates presented in this report take account of the distribution of facilities for higher education, the curricular offerings of the various types of institutions, the general level of education, and the past record of habits of college attendance in the State of California. Fundamental to all estimates of need for facilities for higher education is the prediction of the state's population. A population study includes the number of persons, their origin, distribution, age, characteristics and vitality.[29]

In the report, higher education was defined as follows:

> For purposes of this inquiry, California's student population is considered to be all those attending institutions providing training beyond the twelfth grade of school. Although junior colleges are by law classified secondary schools, they are included in this investigation because they offer the first two years of work contained in four-year colleges and universities.[30]

Strayer outlined the following premises on population growth and its effect on higher education between 1947 and 1965.

---

[29] Ibid.

[30] Ibid.

> While it may be presumed that the size of California's school population in the years ahead will depend upon the operation of future birthrates, attention must be called to other important facts. First, California's growth has for a long time been heavily influenced by immigrations. A majority of Californians were born outside the state. Heavy immigration has added and will add to California's college population. Second, it is possible to make estimates of future college attendance as far ahead as 1965 with no reference to future birthrates, since the youth who will be freshmen in 1965 were born in 1947. The college population in the fall semester of 1957 was, for the most part, excepting veterans, composed of 18-, 19-, 20-, and 21-year-olds. These were the generations born in 1936, 1937, 1938 and 1939. Those in college in the fall of 1965 will largely be individuals born in 1944, 1945, 1946, and 1947.[31]

Re-Study of the Needs of California in Higher Education. Expanding higher educational demands in the 1950's indicated to the State Department of Education and the University of California Regents that a new study of California's higher education needs was warranted.

The legislature in 1955 approved the money for such a re-study. All recommendations of the Strayer report were approved. Much of the Strayer report was brought up to date; some of it was modified, indicating population and educational changes. The re-study included the following major problems:

1. Potential enrollments in publicly supported institutions of higher education and indepen-

---

[31] Ibid., pp. 52-53.

dently controlled colleges, and universities by 1955, 1960 and 1965, together with the necessary physical facilities to care for these expected enrollment increases.

2. The functions, organization and educational programs of the junior colleges, state colleges, the University of California, and independent institutions, with particular reference to such differentiation of function as seems appropriate among the three types of publicly supported institutions.

3. The government and administration of public higher education, with particular reference to coordination of educational programs in all types of institutions, and to economy in carrying out an over-all plan for the state.

4. Expenditures in higher education for various types and levels of educational services in the four groups of institutions included in the study.

5. The financial ability of the State of California to support its governmental activities, including higher education.[32]

Considerable attention was paid to the community operated junior college. Six of the eleven general summary statements are important to the junior college. They are as follows:

1. Enrollment predictions as developed by the State Department of Finance and used in this study are conservative.

2. The State of California will continue to offer

---

[32]T. R. McConnell, T. C. Holy and H. H. Semans, A Re-Study of the Needs of California in Higher Education (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1955), p. 7.

its youth of college age educational opportunities approximating those now offered, and at reasonable cost.

3. The control of public higher education in California will continue to be divided rather than under a single authority as is now true in fourteen states.

4. A differentiation of functions, so far as possible, of the three segments of higher education, namely, the University of California, the state colleges and the junior colleges, is imperative if unnecessary and wasteful duplication is to be kept at a minimum.

5. The coordination of the programs of these three segments of public higher education will continue to be voluntary--similar to that now provided through the liaison committee of the Regents of the State Board of Education--rather than through the creation of legal means of an intermediary board as in New Mexico and Oklahoma.

6. The California public junior college system, the most extensive and undoubtedly among the best organized and most respected in the nation, has made and continues to make a significant contribution toward equalizing educational opportunities in the state; consequently full encouragement should be given to its development and coordination with the other segments of higher education in the state.[33]

A Study of the Need for Additional Centers of Public Higher Education in California. A third study conducted jointly under the direction of the liaison committee, the State Board of Education, and the Regents of the University

---

[33] Ibid., p. 5.

of California was entitled A Study of the Need for Additional Centers of Public Higher Education in California. This was a continuing study and was conducted under the direction of H. H. Semans of the State Department of Education and T. C. Holy of the University of California. Two main responsibilities bearing on the future needs for expanding publicly supported higher education in California were assigned to the joint staff. They are as follows:

1. To develop a priority list for areas of the State now inadequately served by junior colleges, state colleges and campuses of the University of California.
2. To show the effect which the establishment of new institutions would have on existing ones.[34]

Six principles were outlined for their established educational policy providing educational opportunities as widely as possible within the means of the State and the school districts. They are as follows:

1. The expansion of existing institutions and the establishment of new ones should depend upon the optimum use of the state's resources for higher education in relation to the greatest relative need, both geographically and functionally.
2. Differentiation of these functions so far as possible of the three segments of public higher

---

[34]H. H. Semans and T. C. Holy, A Study of the Need for Additional Centers of Public Higher Education in California (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1951), p. v.

education, namely the junior college, the state college, and the University of California, is imperative if unnecessary and wasteful duplication is to be avoided. This principle has been confirmed by the approval of the State Board of Education and the Regents of the University of California by the recommendation of the re-study of the needs of California in higher education which reads as follows: ". . . that the junior college continue to take particular responsibility for technical curriculums, the state college for occupational curriculums, and the University of California for graduate and professional education and research."

3. The assumption that adequate junior college facilities will be provided through local initiative and state assistance prior to the establishment of additional state college or university campuses is basic to the state college and university enrollment estimates in this report.
4. The financing of new publicly supported institutions should be such that it interferes in no way with the needs, including necessary improvement or expansions of existing ones.
5. In order that a possible new institution may serve the greatest number of eligible students it should be placed near the center of the population served by it.
6. Extension of publicly supported institutions to the degree that the continued operation of private ones long in existence and seemingly serving the community well is jeopardized is not in the public interest.[35]

The legislature and educational leaders in California were aware of the many problems occurring in higher education in the decade after World War II. Aware of the population impact and the demand for training on the college level,

---

[35] Ibid., p. vi.

the State Board of Education and the Regents of the University of California laid the ground work upon which a complete plan could be made. The California Master Plan for Higher Education had its beginnings in the earlier studies sponsored by these two boards.

California's contribution to higher education. California has made two unique contributions to higher education. The first of these contributions was the large-scale development of the junior college. This development has assured the people of California of a variety of educational opportunities and has contributed greatly to the knowledge and skills upon which the wealth and progress of California depends. The second of these is the California Master Plan of Higher Education. The implementation of the Master Plan will easily make California educational systems the best in the nation.[36]

IV. THE CALIFORNIA MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Authorization of Master Plan. It was in the 1959 legislature that Assembly Concurrent Resolution Number 88 was passed.[37] This resolution directed a liaison committee

---

[36]Clark Kerr, An Address Delivered to the California Junior College Administrators. (Yosemite National Park,1961).

[37]Statutes, 1959, Concurrent and Joint Resolutions and Constitutional Amendments, Regular Session, 1959, Ch.200, p. 5769.

of the State Board of Education and the Regents of the University of California to prepare a Master Plan for the expansion, development and integration of the facilities, curriculum and standards of higher education in the junior colleges, state colleges, the University of California, and other institutions of higher education.[38]

The inclusion of the junior college in the Master Plan study gave important recognition to the position of the junior college in higher education. This was the first time in any state that the junior college had been included as an equal partner in a tri-partite system of post-high school education. The Survey Team of the Master Plan felt that the junior college should be community based and should be governed by a local lay board that did not operate a high school or a unified district. The Survey Team did suggest a definition of legal residence for non-resident tuition purposes and a standardization of probation and dismissal practices as needed by the junior colleges. The recommendations in the California Master Plan affecting the junior college are as follows:

Functions. The junior college shall be governed by a

---

[38]The Liaison Committee of the State Board of Education and the Regents of the University of California, A Master Plan for Higher Education in California (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1960), p. 1.

local board selected for the purpose from each district maintaining one or more junior colleges. The State Board of Education shall prescribe minimum standards for the formation and operation of junior colleges, and shall exercise general supervision over said junior colleges, as prescribed by law. Said junior colleges shall offer instruction through, but not beyond, the 14th grade level, including, but not limited to, one or more of the following: (a) standard collegiate courses for transfer to higher institutions; (b) vocational advanced technical fields leading to employment; and (c) general, or liberal arts courses. Studies in these fields may lead to the Associate in Arts or the Associate in Science degree. Nothing in this section shall be construed as altering the status of the junior college as part of the public schools system as defined elsewhere in the constitution.

Admission policies and procedures.

1. In order to raise materially standards for admission to the lower division, the state colleges select first-time freshmen from the top one-third (33-1/3%) and the University from the top one-eighth (12½%) of all graduates of California public high schools.
2. Junior college functions now carried by state colleges and non-degree lower division programs at any state college or university campus (other than extension) be subject to the following rules: the equivalent of junior college out-of-district tuition be charged beginning the fall, 1960, against the counties of residence of all lower division students who are ineligible to admission by regular standards, and the funds collected paid to the general fund of the State. Furthermore, that such junior college functions now carried by state colleges at state expense be terminated not later than July 1, 1964, all admittees thereafter being required to meet standard entrance requirements.

Distribution of lower division students.

In order to implement more fully the action of the Regents of the University of California and the State Board of Education, in 1955 "the University of California emphasizes policies leading to the reduction of lower

division enrollments in relation to those of the upper graduate divisions, and the state college pursues policies which will have a similar effect, the percentage of undergraduates in lower division of both the state college and the university be gradually decreased 10 percentage points below that existing in 1960 (estimated to be 51% in both segments) by 1975. It further recommends that the determination of the means by which the recommendations can best be carried out be the responsibility of the governing boards.

Enrollment limitations and projected plant needs.

1. With respect to the establishment of new state colleges and campuses of the university, the governing boards reaffirm their action taken in joint session on April 15, 1959, to the effect that "no new state colleges or campuses of the university, other than those already approved, shall be established until adequate junior college facilities have been provided, the determination of adequacy to be based on studies made under the direction of the liaison committee of the State Board of Education and the Regents of the University of California."
2. With further provisions that the new state colleges and campuses of the university established by action of the legislature in 1957, and by action of the Regents, also 1957, be limited to upper division and graduate work until such time as adequate junior colleges are provided for in primary areas served by these institutions.

Junior college support.

1. Procedures be devised to assure that all funds allocated to and for junior colleges for current expenses or for capital outlay by the state be expended only for junior college purposes, and further that the law be clarified to require that all funds received from county junior college tuition funds for use of buildings and equipment be expended solely for junior college purposes.
2. In view of the added local financial obligations, both for current expenses and capital outlay, which will result from the Master Plan Survey recommendations designed to divert to the junior colleges

some 50,000 lower division students from the 1975 estimates from the state colleges and the University of California, and the attendant savings to the state resulting therefrom, the following actions to be taken:

a) Procedures and methods be devised and adopted by the legislature that will increase the proportion of total current support paid to the junior colleges from the state school fund (augmented for this purpose) from the approximately 30 per cent now in effect to approximately 45 per cent to be achieved not later than 1975.

b) A continuing program be devised and adopted by the legislature that would distribute construction funds, either through grants or loans or both, for capital outlay purposes annually to junior colleges as determined by growth, this program being for the purpose of assisting junior colleges to meet the facilities needed of projected enrollments and of the student to be diverted to the junior college.

3. All of the territory of the state not now included within districts operating junior colleges be brought to junior college districts as rapidly as possible, so that all parts of the state can share in the operation, control, and support of junior colleges. Pending the achievement of this objective, means be devised to require areas that are not a part of a district operating a junior college to contribute toward education at a rate or level consistent with the contributions to junior college support presently made by areas included in districts that maintain junior colleges.[39]

The status of the California junior college has gained much from the implementation of the Master Plan. In the eyes of the public, the term junior college for many

---

[39] Ibid., pp. 1-15.

years meant an undefined institution that vacillated between being a high school appendage and a lower division college preparatory institution. The significance of being categorized as an institution of higher learning by the Master Plan Survey Team gave the junior college a much deserved status.

The responsibility of the junior college becomes greater as a member of higher education when: (1) by July 1, 1964, all junior college functions now being carried out by the state college will be relinquished to the junior college; (2) the reduction of lower division functions by the state college and the university will be effective starting in the fall of 1962. This change will be accomplished by a selection of only the top one-third (33-1/3 per cent) of the graduates of public and private high schools in California for state college entrance, and the top one-eighth (12½ per cent) for University of California entrance. These limiting factors will return to the junior college 50,000 students between now and 1975; and (3) no new state colleges or campuses of the university other than those already provided shall be established until adequate junior college facilities have been provided for. The report points out twenty-two school districts and areas

needing new junior colleges.[40]

Demographic estimates point up the fact that by 1975 these twenty-two colleges will have an enrollment of 56,650.[41] The obvious movement on the part of the existing junior colleges, unified and union high school districts is to direct all efforts to the creation of independent junior college districts; the independent legal structure insures more effective educational operation. One of the greatest innovations to come out of the Master Plan was the policy enacted in the legislature that the territory of all high school and unified districts shall be included in districts maintaining junior colleges.[42] This legislative policy culminates fifty years of community college development in California.

V. LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND OF JUNIOR COLLEGE DEVELOPMENT IN CALIFORNIA

The establishment of any public institution necessarily results from a history of legislation prompted by the desires

---

[40] Ibid., pp. 104-14.

[41] Ibid., p. 112.

[42] California Statutes, 1961, Ch. 1077, p. 2809, Section 1.

and needs of the electorate. The California junior college is no exception. Over fifty years ago the first legislation establishing a junior college was passed by the California legislature. The law read as follows:

> The board of trustees of any city, district, union, joint union or county high school may prescribe post-graduate courses of study for the graduates of such high school, or other high schools, which courses of study shall approximate the studies prescribed in the first two years of university courses. The board of trustees of any city, district, union, joint union, or county high school wherein the post-graduate courses of study are taught may charge tuition for pupils living without the boundaries of the district wherein such courses are taught.[43]

This law proposed by Senator Anthony Caminetti of Amador county was the first legal provision in California extending free public education in the secondary school system to the college level. Although the legislation made no reference to the term junior college, the designation was used in Fresno three years later by the first high school to avail itself of the provision of the new law.

First junior college. In 1910 the Board of Education for Fresno High School authorized the establishment of a two-year post graduate course in connection with the high school. As a result, Fresno Junior College became the

---

[43] California Statutes, 1907, 190, Ch. 69, p. 88.

first institution of its kind in the state.[44]

First financial support. Although legal provision for the establishment of the junior college had been made, financial support for the existence of the junior college was not forthcoming. It was not until legislation was enacted in 1917 that the movement was considerably advanced. Provisions were passed (1) authorizing governing boards of high school districts to organize junior colleges as separate schools and designating the junior colleges as secondary schools; (2) limiting the organization of the new junior colleges to high school districts that had an assessed valuation of three million dollars or more; (3) outlining in more detail the junior college courses of study that could be offered, including mechanical and industrial arts, household economy, agriculture, civic education, commerce, and courses leading to the junior certificate at the University of California; (4) providing that each course established by the governing board of the district was subject to approval by the State Board of Education; (5) requiring sixty credit hours for graduation and defining

---

[44]C. L. McLane, "The Junior College, Or Upward Extension of the High School," School Review, XXI (March, 1913), 64.

a credit hour; (6) providing for the maintenance of attendance records and including such attendance records with the annual report of the high school; (7) limiting admission to junior college courses to high school graduates and such other candidates at least twenty-one years of age and recommended for admission by the principal of the high school maintaining such junior college courses; and (8) providing that no state high school funds be apportioned to any high school district on account of students enrolled in junior college courses unless such courses have been approved by the State Board of Education.[45]

Many of the enactments and features of this law are in effect today, such as the requirements that each course has to be approved by the local governing board and the State Board of Education, that sixty credit hours are necessary for graduation, and that attendance records must be maintained and reported with the high school attendance.

First comprehensive legislation. In 1919 a special legislative study committee investigated various laws and programs and came up with several recommendations for the strengthening of the junior college. As a result of this

---

[45]California Statutes, 1917, Ch. 304, pp. 463-64, Sections 1, 2.

study, legislation was proposed and enacted in the 1921 legislature which (1) established the junior colleges as part of the secondary school system and permitted the formation of junior college districts, and (2) made provisions for the establishment of three different kinds of junior college districts, (3) set up regulations for the formation of junior college districts including (4) the election of a district board and (5) regular elections thereafter, (6) established procedures for discontinuing the district if the enrollment of students fell below seventy-five, (7) established rules for board meetings, and (8) defined duties of the board, (9) clearly stated the nature of the junior college program including standards for admissions, courses, and graduation, (10) required reports on attendance and other statistics, (11) provided for purchase of ground and erection of buildings (12) set up a process of estimating the amount to be used as a basis for the levy of the special tax for the maintenance of the junior college, (13) designated that the supervisors would levy the special tax, (14) set up a special fund for the credit of the junior college district, (15) required that the cost of educating a student who lived in a district not maintaining a junior college should be paid by the county of the student's residence, (16) provided that the State

Board of Education could set up minimum standards to be met for state aid, (17) provided that the legislation of 1917 discussed on page two and three of this study was not repealed, (18) set up a possible affiliation with the University of California whereby classes would be inspected, visited and accredited, and (19) permitted a contract with normal schools or teachers' colleges for the maintenance of junior college courses.[46]

In 1921 legislation also authorized the State to make an annual payment of $2,000 as the junior college allotment plus $100 per unit of average daily attendance during the preceding school year to each junior college district provided a like amount were raised by the junior college district for the maintenance of the junior college during the preceding year.[47]

Types of junior college district. The three types of independent junior college districts authorized by the 1921 law were (1) a junior college district co-terminus with the high school district, (2) a union junior college district made up of two or more contiguous high school

---

[46] California Statutes, 1921, Ch. 495, pp. 756-65, Sections 1-19.

[47] California Statutes, 1921, Ch. 470, p. 715, Section 3.

districts in the same county and (3) a county-wide junior college district embracing all territory of the county not included in any junior college district and having an average daily attendance of four hundred pupils.[48]

It may be noted that within this framework of early legislation the junior college movement became firmly established in California. From 1921 to 1927 there was a steady increase in both the number of junior colleges and the number of junior college districts. Fifteen junior colleges were added during this period to make a total of thirty-six institutions. The enrollments increased from 1,442 to 8,178.[49] The law was amended in 1927 by adding two more types of districts: (1) joint union junior college (two or more contiguous high school districts in two or more contiguous counties)[50] and (2) joint county junior college (comprising contiguous territory in all of two or more counties).[51]

---

[48] California Statutes, 1921, Ch. 495, p. 756, Section 2.

[49] State Department of Education, California Public Junior College (Sacramento: Bulletin State Department of Education, February, 1958), p. 68.

[50] California Statutes, 1927, Ch. 708, p. 1278, Section 3.

[51] California Statutes, 1927, Ch. 708, p. 1279, Section 5.

In 1929 the legislature enacted the School Code, the provisions of which affected the junior colleges in part by (1) designating the course of study to be offered, (2) setting up standards for the admission of students, (3) providing requirements for graduation, (4) defining a credit hour and (5) delimiting the authority of the state in establishing rules and regulations fixing the minimum standards entitling junior colleges to state aid.[52]

The next important legislation affecting the California junior college was enacted in 1931. In that year the School Code of the State of California (1) set forth criteria for the organization of new districts, (2) outlined regulations for the use of the state survey of proposed districts and required that in each instance a report of the survey results be submitted by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction with his recommendations to the State Board of Education for action, (3) required that an election be held to obtain the approval of qualified voters for the proposed district, (4) required that an election be held to provide members of the board of trustees for the new district, and (5) specified for district boards of trustees the manner of their organization,

---

[52] 1929 School Code of California, Sections 3.350, 3412.

their powers, their duties, their meeting dates and filing of membership vacancy.[53]

In 1943 the provisions of the School Code were recodified into the Education Code; thereafter laws applicable to the junior college were found in the Education Code.

Recent legislation. The 1961 legislature, following many suggestions set forth in the California Master Plan, even more firmly established the junior college as an integral part of higher education in California.

Dr. Ronald Cox, consultant in junior college education for the California State Department of Education, in a speech to Fresno County School administrators on December 12, 1961, called the legislation introduced in 1961 the Magna Carta of junior college education in California.[54]

This important enactment is as follows:

> The Legislature hereby declares as its policy that the territory of all high school districts and unified districts shall be included in districts maintaining a junior college. In order to permit school districts to conform voluntarily to this policy the provisions of this article shall not become operative until February 1, 1964.[55]

---

[53] California Statutes, Ch. 1216, pp. 2586-91, sections 2-27.

[54] Ronald Cox, An Address The Proposed Fresno Regional Junior College (Fresno: Fresno City College, 1961).

[55] California Statutes, 1961, Ch. 1077, p. 2809, section 1.

After February 1, 1964, the county committees shall prepare plans and recommendations for the formation of junior college districts in their territories. Where more than one county is involved, members of each county shall be included and shall be augmented as provided in Education Code, Section 3113.[56] The usual procedure for the county committee study shall be followed.

The law provided that ". . .after February 1, 1963, no district, except a junior college district, shall be formed to maintain a junior college."[57] The 1959 legislature had provided legal procedures to be followed in creating the various types of junior college organizations, or in altering existing junior college districts.[58]

In 1961 the legislature also set up standards for the formation of junior college districts. The law provided that the State Board of Education shall not approve a petition to form a junior college district if the estimated potential average daily attendance of the district is less than one thousand units of average

---

[56] California Statutes, 1961, Ch. 1077, p. 2810, section 1.

[57] Ibid.

[58] California Statutes, 1959, Ch. 2, pp. 718 ff.

daily attendance.[59]

No junior college district shall be formed if the assessed valuation of taxable property in the proposed district is less than $150,000 for each unit of estimated potential average daily attendance.[60]

However because of isolation or inaccessability of a territory to an existing junior college the board may approve a proposed district which does not come up to the above standard.[61] These standards do not apply to the formation of a new junior college district consisting wholly or partially of territory of a unified district or union high school district maintaining a junior college.[62]

The legislature provided for the separation of junior colleges from high school districts or unified districts and the formation of new junior college districts.[63] Each county committee shall study the role of the junior college maintained by a high school or unified district and its relationship with adjacent areas. The committee shall publish a report of the study on or before

---

[59] California Statutes, 1961, Ch. 1935, p. 4084, Section 1.

[60] Ibid. [61] Ibid. [62] Ibid.

[63] California Statutes, 1961, Ch. 1935, P. 4084, Section 1.

January 30, 1963.[64] On or after July 1, 1963, the county committee may direct the County Superintendent of Schools to call an election to form a new junior college district. A petition by 10 per cent of the registered voters shall require such directive to be issued.[65] The county committee shall set the boundaries for the proposed district; the recommendation shall include all of the territory of the high school or unified district maintaining a junior college and may include additional territory.[66]

---

[64] Ibid., p. 4085.

[65] Ibid.

[66] Ibid.,pp. 4085-86, section 1.

CHAPTER III

FACTORS RELATING TO JUNIOR COLLEGE ATTENDANCE

I. PROXIMITY OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE TO THE STUDENT

The closeness or proximity of a junior college should generally be defined as the distance which a student must travel from his home to the college without undue hardship. The junior college has gained the name "community college" in California because it serves the people within commuting distance.

The California Master Plan studies indicate that almost all junior college students are attending institutions within commuting distance of their homes.[1] The "Strayer Report" concluded that if junior college facilities are not available, the number of students enrolling in higher education will diminish:

> The presence of the junior college facilities increases the number of high school graduates who continue their education past twelfth grade. A survey of 17,391 high school graduates of California's high schools in June, 1947, revealed that whereas 54.4 per cent of the graduates of high schools within a

---

[1] Liaison Committee of the State Board of Education and the Regents of the University of California, A Master Plan for Higher Education in California 1960-1975 (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1960), p. 91.

> junior college district did continue, only 45.9 per cent of graduates outside a junior college district continued their education. Every patronage is accorded a junior college when they are near at hand.[2]

Semans and Holy, in a report for the California State Department of Education, made the following conclusions:

> The proximity of an institution is an important factor in the percentage of those eligible who attended. For example, Alameda, Yolo, Santa Barbara, and Riverside counties, where campuses of the University of California are located, rank high in the per cent of those eligible to enter the University of California who actually do so. In Humboldt, Butte, Santa Clara, Fresno and San Diego counties, where there are well established regional state colleges, a high per cent of those eligible actually enroll. There is a similar proportion among the junior colleges in Shasta, Napa, Kern and Madera counties.[3]

The college attendance by graduates of the 1947 class from fifty-six schools both in and outside junior college districts is given in Table I. It is clear that the high school graduates who resided within junior college districts were more likely to enter college. As early as 1947, seventy of every one hundred high school graduates residing within a junior college district and continuing their

---

[2]Monroe E. Deutsch, Aubrey A. Douglass, and George D. Strayer, A Report of a Survey of the Needs of California in Higher Education (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1948), p. 76.

[3]H. H. Semans and T. C. Holy, A Study of the Need for Additional Centers of Public Higher Education in California (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1957), p. 132.

education attended a junior college.

Of high school graduates who resided outside of junior college districts, only forty-two of every one hundred continuing their education enrolled in a junior

TABLE I*

A SURVEY OF COLLEGE ATTENDANCE OF 1947 HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES OF FIFTY-SIX SCHOOLS

Item	High Schools Within J.C. Districts	High Schools Outside J.C. Districts
No. of High Schools	28	28
No. June, 1947, Graduates	9,641	7,750
No. Continuing Education	5,233	3,557
Per Cent Continuing	54.36	45.90
Of Those Continuing, Per Cent in:		
Junior Colleges	70.3	41.9
State Colleges	8.4	19.5
University of California	8.3	13.6
Private Colleges	9.1	14.6
Other Education	4.1	10.6
Of All Grads, Per Cent in:		
Junior Colleges	38.1	19.2
State Colleges	4.6	8.9
University of California	4.5	6.2
Private Colleges	4.9	6.7
Other Education	2.2	4.9
Not Continuing Higher Education	45.7	54.1

*Monroe E. Deutsch, Aubrey A. Douglas and George D. Strayer, A Report of a Survey of the Needs of California in Higher Education (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1948), p. 76.

college. High school graduates living outside a junior college district went on to a state college, to the University of California, to private colleges, and to other institutions in greater proportions than did high school graduates living within junior college districts.

An extensive study of geographic sources of California college freshmen was made in 1955 by the California Department of Finance. The Department reported that in the areas of Sacramento, Santa Clara, Los Angeles and Orange counties more than half of all twelfth grade graduates enroll in college. In such areas as the northeastern part of the state including Lake and Mendocino counties and the eastern mountain counties of the north San Joaquin area where there is a paucity of college level instruction only one-fourth of the high school graduates attend college.[4] The proximity of college facilities is undoubtedly a major factor in college attendance.

At the junior college level, however, the results of this 1955 study indicate that within the boundaries of each college enrollment area and sub area having a higher than

---

[4]California State Department of Finance, Division of Budgets and Accounts, Geographic Sources of California's College Freshmen, A Graphic Summary (Sacramento: California State Department of Finance, Financial Research Section, May, 1955), p. 1.

average percentage of freshmen entering junior college, there is located one or more well established, widely recognized junior college. State colleges are located in six of the nine areas which had the lowest percentage of freshmen attending junior college. The southern regions of the state have gone farthest in developing junior colleges. With 55 per cent of the state's high school graduates, "Southern California accounts for 65 per cent of all new junior college freshmen."[5]

The Educational Policies Commission, in a report on higher education, recognized that one of the many barriers to attending college for qualified young people is the great distance to college. The Commission reported as follows:

> Distance from college is another factor, obviously related to finance, in determining whether qualified young people go to college. Students from low income families who live within commuting distance of the college--a distance now much greater than formerly--are much more likely to continue their education than similar youths in other areas. In areas that are well supplied with college programs, the highest percentage of youths continue their schooling, either because of proximity to institutions of higher education or because of the community interest in advanced education which was probably responsible for the establishment of the colleges. The percentage of youth attending college drops when only one type of college program is provided, and sinks even lower in communities that are without

---

[5] Ibid., p. 20.

> any college facilities--and there are many large communities in urban centers of population without any higher educational facilities. These considerations indicate the importance of college programs which meet the educational needs of the community.[6]

II. INCREASED DEMAND FOR COLLEGE EDUCATION

Because our population is growing so fast, the weight of sheer numbers is being felt by all of our institutions of higher learning. If the demographers' predictions for California are to be considered and accepted, preparation for additional higher educational facilities is needed immediately.

California has doubled its population every twenty years since 1860. Since 1940 California has grown 114 per cent; the rest of the United States has grown 32 per cent. Fresno County has kept pace with the rest of the state by growing 139 per cent since 1940. Madera County has grown 79 per cent.[7]

The United States Educational Policy Commission,

---

[6]Educational Policies Commission, Higher Education in a Decade of Decision (Washington, D. C.: National Educational Association of the United States and the American Association of School Administrators, 1957), p. 27.

[7]Office of the Governor of California, The California Story (Sacramento: California State Printing Office, 1960), p. 1.

aware of the rapid population growth and increased demand for higher education, reported as follows:

> Able young people from all economic cultural levels are today attending colleges and universities. While high school graduates whose parents hold managerial or professional jobs are much more likely than other young people to go to college, college attendance is by no means restricted to high income families. In fact, a great proportion of college students today come from homes of modest income. Taxpayers and philanthropists alike have kept open the door of educational opportunities for many able youths. Promising young people from underprivileged homes seek a college education as a way to overcome social and economic handicaps. College education is a prime factor in safeguarding upward social mobility in America today.[8]

The Commission study points to three factors that need attention in the near future:

1. College enrollments will grow even if only the present proportion of that age group continues to enroll.
2. Pressures to enroll and to remain in college longer are increasing; it is possible that a larger proportion of qualified youth will seek college and will complete the program for which they matriculate.
3. Colleges and universities themselves are under pressure to develop new programs of both general and technical education to meet economic and social needs as well as student and parental demands; new and improved college programs will attract more students.[9]

These premises need to be examined before recommendations can be made concerning admission policies.

---

[8]Educational Policies Commission, op. cit., pp.22-23.

[9]Ibid., p. 28.

One of the greatest concerns of the National Education Association and the Educational Policy Commission is the problem of the unqualified people who do not or cannot go to college. The Commission, in conjunction with the American Association of School Administrators, has committed itself as follows:

> There is a rich reservoir of ability and need which has not been adequately utilized at the college level. ...virtually all persons who go beyond the twelfth grade are qualified for post high school study... Yet the striking loss of talent occurs before and at the point of high school graduation; significant numbers of youth who are able to meet the standards of admission do not enroll in college. The Commission of Human Resources and Advanced Training concluded in 1954 that fewer than half of the upper 25 per cent of all high school graduates ever earn college degrees; only 6 out of 10 of the top 5 per cent do. These conclusions are based on studies conducted over a period of years before 1954. While more recent studies indicate that larger proportions of high ability students are now going to college, it is still true that large numbers of qualified young people do not secure higher education. This "erosion" in America's human resources deprives the individual and society of the benefits of fully developed talents. With manpower needs as acute as they are, the erosion is a serious loss.[10]

Assuming that the same percentage of college age persons continue on to college, college enrollments should increase from 2.77 million students in 1956 to 4.37 million by 1970. The concern of the Educational Policies Commission

---

[10] Ibid., p. 29.

was that, with this great number of students, many able, qualified students would be kept off the higher educational pathway and their potential contribution lost. This problem should be of concern to each individual in our society.

The late assemblywoman, Dorothy Donahue, Chairman of the Assembly Education Committee and author of a bill that set up the Master Plan for California, made the following statements at an address to the California Junior College Association fall conference in 1955:

> A new child enters a classroom every third minute of every day in California. Fifty-three thousand new classrooms will have to be built within the next five years, or one new classroom every ten minutes of each working day for the next five years. There are now more than 2,300,000 18-year-olds, and in 1960 there will be 2,800,000 18-year-olds, and by 1975 there will be 4,000,000 18-year-olds in the United States. Thirty-one out of every hundred people in the United States attend college today. Four out of every hundred people in the United States attended in 1900. One out of four people are now going to school.[11]

In California, the Master Plan Team, in a survey of all educational institutions and functions, predicted that the demand for future higher education will be as follows:

...for every 100 full-time students enrolled in

---

[11]Dorothy Donahue, An Address The Junior College--Its Problems and Challenges (Yosemite: California Junior College Association Fall Conference, 1955).

> each segment of higher education in the fall of 1958, the fall of 1975 would see 276 students in the junior colleges, 449 students in the state colleges, 316 students in the University of California, and 158 students in the independent colleges and universities.[12]

This problem of increasing enrollments in all California institutions of higher learning is being dealt with in a variety of ways. Many new junior colleges are being built or are in the planning stages. The idea of the community college which offers the lower division work, either for preparation for transfers or for terminal education, has rapidly spread to every community in California. The state colleges and the University of California will send students who cannot initially qualify for entrance to these two institutions back to the junior colleges. It is evident that the junior college in California will be a primary factor in filling the void in higher education.

III. SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS

Thousands of highly qualified high school graduates have been unable to attend an institution of higher learning. Probably the biggest factor in their non-attendance has been an economic one. This barrier is very

---

[12] Liaison Committee of the State Board of Education and the Regents of the University of California, op. cit., p. 53.

evident today; not even a substantial percentage of upper ability college age persons is enrolled in college. The Educational Policies Commission reported:

> In spite of progress in providing educational opportunities, certain barriers remain for some qualified students. High among these barriere are financial obstacles. The economic level of the home from which the student comes influences his opportunity for college training. Pressures of family need combined with current high wages for relatively untrained beginners tend to push an able young person off the education path and into a vocational blind alley. The financial handicap for gifted students seeking higher education is a tangible fact.[13]

One of the strongest constructive forces to combat the financial barrier to a student's attending a college in California has been the establishment of the junior college. The phenomenal percentage of high school graduates going on to college in California as compared to the national percentage attests to this fact. Barber, in 1949, investigated the reasons why 111 able high school graduates did not enter college. The compilation of answers included the respondent's first, second, and third reasons for not being able to go on to college. Listed according to priority, the reasons given for not going on to college were:

---

[13]Educational Policies Commission, op. cit., p. 27.

1. Lack of finances (34%)
2. Lack of academic interest (20%)
3. Preference for work experience (13%)
4. Lack of serious purpose (12%)
5. Total of eleven other reasons (21%)[14]

These reasons came as no surprise to most educators. Barber, in carrying the results of his study to a logical conclusion, was interested in finding a solution to the problem confronting these able students. He offered the following recommendations:

1. Early diagnosis to discover pupils of college ability. College aptitude should be diagnosed as early as ninth grade.
2. Motivational counseling. The high frequency of lack of academic interest and "lack of serious interest" has plainly suggested great need for motivational counseling.
3. Early contacts with parents to induce them to overcome economic barriers where they exist.[15]

In its study, Higher Education in a Decade of Decision, the Educational Policies Commission stated:

> While notable advances have been made during the recent decades in opening the doors to higher education for members of minority groups, the task is not yet done. Closely related to economic and cultural barriers to higher education are barriers arising from minority group status. Among the groups having large numbers of able youths who do not ordinarily seek or find a college education are the Negroes, Mexican immigrants, and the recently arrived Puerto Ricans. Many are deprived of higher education both by

---

[14]Leroy E. Barber, "Why Some Able High School Graduates Do Not Go to College," School Review, LIX (February, 1950), p. 95.

[15]Ibid.

inadequacy in schooling and by poor environments.

> Since urgent need for educated talent arises from the present manpower situation, and since the nation is committed to the ideal of personal development for all, and since deprivation of minority groups make the United States a target for dangerous anti-democratic propaganda on an international level, exclusion of higher education for qualified members of minority groups is particularly unfortunate and unwise. The task of eliminating educational barriers is related to that of eliminating occupational barriers. It is an urgent task of national consequences.[16]

IV. COLLEGE ATTENDANCE AND MENTAL ABILITY

In an effort to determine the academic ability of the junior college student, the joint staff of the Liaison Committee and the Regents of the University of California, and the California State Board of Education undertook a study in June, 1955, of graduates of public high schools in certain California counties.

Three questions were asked:

1. How are California high schools distributed according to their eligibility for admission to (a) the University of California, (b) state colleges, and (c) the junior colleges?
2. Of those who are eligible to enter each of these educational institutions, what proportion actually does enter?
3. How do the admission requirements of these institutions relate to the academic ability of those who qualify for admission?[17]

---

[16] Educational Policies Commission, op. cit., p. 28.

[17] Semans and Holy, op. cit., p. 123.

In this study questionnaires were sent to the principals of the high schools in forty-one select California counties, 83 per cent of whom responded representing 265 high schools having a total of 41,423 high school graduates; 11.4 per cent met the requirements for admittance to the University of California; 43.6 per cent met the requirements for both university and state college entrance. The remaining 23,371 students, or 56.4 per cent of the total graduates, did not meet the entrance requirements of the University of California or state colleges. The significant point is that for 23,371 of the 41,423 June, 1955, graduates the only opportunity to attend a publicly supported institution of higher education of the state was offered by the public junior college. The responsibility of the local communities throughout the state is made very clear, for if an adequate system of junior colleges is not provided, their young people will be deprived of the opportunities of continuing their education.

The same study reported that of the total June, 1955, graduates only 43 per cent continued with higher education in California. Specifically, of the 41,423 graduates, 17,836 continued on at the University of California, the state colleges, private colleges or to public junior colleges. The distribution of these 17,826

graduates follows:

Institution Attended	No. of Students	% of Total 1955 Graduates
University of Calif.	1819	4.4
State Colleges	3898	9.4
Private Colleges	1932	4.7
Junior Colleges	10,177	24.6[18]

Approximately 47 per cent of those students who were not eligible for admission to a university or state college enrolled in a junior college. In contrast, of those eligible to enroll at the University of California, 38.7 per cent actually enrolled at this university. In the case of the state colleges only 21.6 per cent of those eligible actually did enroll in state colleges.

In addition to the data requested concerning the number of students going to the various types of institutions of higher education, the second part of the questionnaire asked for information regarding the mental abilities of the students who went on to college and to junior college. There were three parts to this question.

> One, the high schools were asked to report the mental abilities expressed as intelligence quotients and the percentile ranks of students who qualified for the University of California. Two, they were to report the intelligence quotients and the percentile

---

[18] Ibid., p. 124.

> of students not qualifying for the University but for state colleges. Three, the schools were to report the mental abilities of the remaining graduates who qualified for neither the University nor a state college.[19]

This third group included the students who had no choice but to enter a junior college if they wished to continue on to a thirteenth grade. Table II from the publication Need for Additional Centers of Higher Education in California reports the results of this part of the questionnaire. It will be seen from this data that of the students who qualified for admission to the University of California and to the state colleges, 36.2 per cent and 11.0 per cent respectively were in the group with intelligence quotients over 120, whereas only 3.8 per cent of this same group qualified for entrance to neither type of institution. It may also be noted that approximately 59 per cent of the students who qualified for university entrance had intelligence quotients of 115 or over, whereas of those who qualified for state colleges, 50.6 per cent fell within the 100-114 intelligence quotient group. In the group that qualified for neither state institution, 59.2 per cent fell within the category of 90 to 109 intelligence quotient. In terms of the modal point, that of the university falls

---

[19] Ibid., p. 125.

within the above 120 group, that of the state colleges within the 100 to 109 group, and that of the remainder (those who meet neither qualification) within the 100 to 109 and 90 to 99 groups.[20]

TABLE II*

Distribution of Some 1955 School Graduates from Thirty Selected California Counties Whose Intelligence Quotients Meet the Admission Requirements of California and State Colleges

Entrance Requirements	No. of High School Grads Meet Requirements	No. of High School Grads I.Q.'s Reported	%age Distribution of Intelligence Quotients 120+	120-115	114-110	109-100	99-90	Below 90
Group A - Univ. entrance requirements	2,996	2,216	36.2	23.0	18.0	19.0	3.3	.5
Group B - State College entrance requirements	8,868	6,913	11.0	12.7	16.4	34.2	19.0	6.7
Group C - Neither Univ. nor State Col. entrance requirements	15,428	12,568	3.8	6.0	9.6	29.6	29.6	21.4
Totals	27,292	21,597	9.4	9.8	12.6	30.0	23.6	14.6

*H. H. Semans and T. C. Holy, A Study of the Need for Additional Centers of Public Higher Education in California (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1957), p. 133.

[20] Ibid., p. 132.

According to the Commission on Human Resources, which quoted the results of the Army General Classification Testing Program:

> One out of two of those in the top quarter of those who go to college graduate. Of the top two per cent, eight out of ten graduate; of the top ten per cent seven out of ten graduate; of those who are around the 25th percentile above 110 I.Q., from four to five out of ten graduate. It is clear that as the intelligence of the individual increases, his chances of success in college become more favorable.[21]

Hollingshead stated that college enrollment was related to such various factors as (1) academic ability, (2) family income, (3) sex, (4) race, (5) geography, and (6) social status. He also attempted to bring into focus the two major problems which are basic to the work of the Commission on Financing Higher Education:

1. What proportion of our young people of college age should our institutions of higher education attempt to educate?
2. How far have we succeeded in achieving such a goal?[22]

The President's Advisory Commission on Higher Education estimated that 49 per cent of the population could profit from at least two years of post high school education. In terms of intelligence ratings, this report

---

[21] Byron S. Hollingshead, Who Should Go to College (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952), p. 15.

[22] Ibid., p. 16.

assumed that all boys and girls with intelligence quotients of 101 and higher can do profitable work beyond the high school level. The President's Commission gave a much higher estimate of the proportion of American youth who can profit substantially from college work. Most authorities have estimated that about 25 per cent of the population can do college work profitably.[23]

The Educational Policies Commission recommended four broad lines upon which to base college admission policy.

1. Every effort should be made to provide higher education for all youths who are capable of profiting by it. . .
2. In admission policies heavy emphasis should be placed on attracting those who are particularly gifted. . .
3. Admission efforts should be active rather than passive; the task is one of selective recruitment rather than of admissions. . .
4. Continued recognition must be given to students' self selection for college. . .[24]

---

[23] Ibid., p. 16.

[24] Educational Policies Commission, op. cit., pp.34-35.

CHAPTER IV

PREDICTING JUNIOR COLLEGE ENROLLMENTS IN FRESNO REGIONAL COLLEGE AREA TO 1980

The three factors that will affect college enrollment in the 60's and beyond are:

1. California's immigration in the 40's and 50's.
2. California's increasing birthrate.
3. The increased emphasis on higher education for American youths.

During the half century from 1900 to 1950 in which the United States population more than doubled, California population increased more than 600 per cent, from 1½ million to more than 10½ million.[1]

California continues to grow rapidly. No other state of comparable size in the nation has had such unpredictable growth since 1940 as has the state of California. The annual rate of increase is approximately three times that of the entire United States. Much of this enlargement is due to the immigration from other states. In a report published by the editors of the United States News and World Report, the following concise sentences summarized the growth potential to be experienced in California:

> California to the top. Not all parts of the country are to grow equally, or at the same rate. The West, you

---

[1]California State Department of Finance, California Population in 1956 (Sacramento: Budget Division, Financial Research Section, July, 1956), p. 9.

> discover, can expect continued growth on a very broad scale. The bulk of this growth--more than two-thirds of it--will come within a single state: California. By 1975, this state that sprawls far more than 1,000 miles along the Pacific Ocean will have added 12,200,000 people to its present population of 13.4 million. With a 1975 total of 25.6 million, California will be the largest state in the union, leaving New York far behind. The present New York population of 16.2 million will expand to 21.8 million in 1975. A new empire is emerging along the Pacific coast, and California is the heart of this empire. The state's rising tide of population traces to many things. Climate, without question, is a magnet for millions. The migration to the West has been predominantly to the southern sectors of the West. Southern California, with its Pacific sunshine and warm winters, is expected to have 38 per cent of the total population in the eleven western states by 1970, according to a study by a group of west coast experts. In addition to climate there is the pull of a maturing economy with many opportunities and of vast natural resources, such as oil and minerals.[2]

Another very important cause for California's increased population is its expanding birthrate. Throughout the United States the year 1933 was a low point in the nation's accrued birthrate. From 1933 to 1956, the total additional number of births nationally was about 1½ times the 1933 rate or 155 per cent. In California, the increase in birthrate from the period 1933 to 1956, was well over 300 per cent. Between 1933 and 1940, the number of births in California increased 50 per cent; from 1940 to 1945 the gain was 64 per cent. The expanding birth rate between 1945 and 1947 resulted in a 33 per cent jump; in the period from 1947 to 1956 there was an addition of

---

[2]"Where Will U.S. Put Sixty Million More People?" U.S. News and World Report, XLIII (August 9, 1957), p. 48.

34 per cent. Therefore, California has experienced the effect not of a "birth wave" but of a rapidly rising tide in which one wave follows close upon the other. In fact, California has grown so rapidly in recent years that its April, 1940, population was doubled by the year 1956, an increase from 6,900,000 to 13,800,000 in fewer than seventeen years.

Modern technological advancements have raised the educational requirements of the individual to the extent that increasing demands for higher education have resulted. By 1975, according to latest predictions, more than one million students will enroll in California's institutions of higher learning. This is nearly triple the 1958 fall term, full-time total enrollment of 225,650 students. The State Department of Finance estimated that California's population was 15,280,000 on July 1, 1959, and would increase to over 25,000,000 by 1975.[3] By the year 2,020 this state is expected to contain 58 million persons, nearly four times its present population.[4]

The California Department of Finance report "Projected Enrollments, California Schools, 1956 to 1970," states that California public schools are now at the peak of an enrollment curve. The actual increases which are predicted for the

---

[3]California State Department of Finance, op. cit., p. 3.

[4]Liaison Committee of the State Board of Education and the Regents of the University of California, A Master Plan for Higher Education in California 1960-1975 (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1960), p. 47.

years from 1955 to 1970 are 62 per cent for elementary schools and 134 per cent for high schools. The report states that the next fifteen years will be characterized by gains in the number of older pupils. Public high schools received only 20 per cent of the state's 1950-55 enrollment growth and will receive almost one-half of the 1965 to 1970 increase. In 1970 there will be 162 public elementary pupils enrolled for every one hundred enrolled in the fall of 1955.

There will be 234 high school pupils for every one hundred recorded in the 1955-56 school year.[5]

The California Master Plan Survey Team used the following assumptions in predicting the growth in numbers of college age students in the 60's and the 70's.

1. The state of California will continue to grow rapidly, reflecting a high level of economic development if there are no major economic setbacks, atomic wars, or natural catastrophies between now and 1975. By that time the state's total population is expected to be in the neighborhood of twenty-five million people.
2. The rates at which children remain in high school until graduation and the geographic distribution of high school graduates until 1975 will in general follow the trends of the past decade.
3. The rates at which California's young people enter colleges will continue to show a gradual increase through 1975.
4. The independent colleges and universities will not expand their facilities at a rate sufficient to maintain their present proportion of enrollment.

---

[5]California State Department of Finance, Division of Budgets and Accounts, Geographic Sources of California's College Freshmen, A Graphic Summary (Sacramento: California State Department of Finance, Financial Research Section, May, 1955), p. 5.

5. The publicly controlled facilities will be limited to institutions in operation, in reporting enrollments in the fall of 1959 with the addition of one junior college, two state colleges and three campuses of the University of California.
6. Each publicly controlled institution within each system will continue to attract students at about the present rates and students will continue current patterns of place of origin and attendance, except as modified by the new institutions. Implicit is a continuation of present admission policies, curricula and other conditions influencing enrollment.
7. Each institution will be able to handle all students who would be able to enroll under these assumptions so that the projected numbers are "potentials" not restricted by site, physical plant, or other limitations that may actually exist.[6]

Population growth for Fresno and Madera Counties

The growth of the Fresno area is primarily due to the expanding agricultural development. Agriculture and its associated industries have made Fresno one of the fastest growing cities in California. Fresno County, in 1960, for the eleventh year has led the nation in agricultural output by a gross income of $381,439,360 from its 10,000 farms.[7]

It is interesting to note Bogue's description of Fresno in his work "The Economic Development of the United States":

> Fresno is a young city. It cannot claim to have a part in the gold rush of the early days of the state. Until the Central California Valley Project and other irrigation developments delivered water to turn the

---

[6]Liaison Committee of the State Board of Education and the Regents of the University of California, op. cit., pp. 51-52.

[7]Fresno County-City Chamber of Commerce, World Capital of Agribusiness, A Report compiled by the Research Department of Fresno County-City Chamber of Commerce (Fresno: Fresno County-City Chamber of Commerce, 1962), p. 1.

> Valley into a garden, it was just a hot dry place useful only for grazing cattle. Since 1910 its growth has been quite rapid, and during the twenty years between 1940 and 1960 it has grown at the phenomenal rate of about 5 per cent a year, which is faster than either Los Angeles or San Francisco.[8]

With the advent of water delivered by the San Luis Project to the arid part of western Fresno County, this growth should continue even more rapidly.

A history of the population of Fresno and Madera Counties is shown as follows:[9]

	1930	1940	1950	1960	Percentage change 1950-1960
Fresno	144,379	178,565	276,515	365,945	32.3%
Madera	17,164	23,314	36,964	40,468	9.5%

"Agribusiness," a term conceived in 1940, expresses the concept that agriculture, industry and business are inter-related and inter-dependent. The 220 commercially grown crops have created demands for artisans, craftsmen and professional and technical personnel. The population growth of Fresno County is directly related to "agribusiness."[10]

---

[8]Donald J. Bogue and Calvin Beale, Economic Areas of the United States (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe Inc., 1961), p. 873.

[9]Economic Development Agency, California Statistical Abstracts (Sacramento: Printing Division Document Section, 1961), p. 38.

[10]Fresno County-City Chamber of Commerce, Fresno is the Place (Fresno: Fresno City Chamber of Commerce Brochure, 1960), p. 7.

Fresno is fast becoming a metropolitan area servicing most of the urban communities in the county. A projection of Fresno County population to 1985 is presented in Table III. Projections for 1980 indicate that Fresno County will grow 1.7 times as much as its present population.

By 1980, as shown in Table III, the Fresno metropolitan area will have a predicted population of 479,000 or 75.7 per cent of the total county population. This includes 70.6 per cent or 446,000 of the entire urban population of the county which leaves 154,000 or 24.3 per cent as non-metropolitan population.

If Madera County's growth continues at its present 9.5 per cent for a ten year period, it should approximate 48,000 people by 1980. At present over one-third of the population of Madera County lives in the city of Madera.

Areas of Junior College attendance

Madera County, because of its outlying communities, presents a commuting problem if its students attend the nearest junior college, Fresno City College. Table IV gives a list of mileage distances to Madera and Fresno from various centers of population in Madera and Fresno Counties.

Dr. Arnold E. Joyal, President of Fresno State College, stated in his doctoral dissertation that the distance a student is willing and able to commute to a junior college depends upon local conditions of roads, traffic barriers, and agencies

TABLE III*

REVISED PRELIMINARY FRESNO COUNTY POPULATION PROJECTIONS

	1950	1960	1965	1970	1975	1980	1985
Fresno Urbanized Area	130,592	211,345	260,000	313,000	374,000[c]	446,000	528,000[c]
Non-urbanized Fresno County	145,923	154,600	160,000	166,000	174,000[c]	186,000	206,000[c]
Non-Farm	90,772	108,500[a]	118,000	128,000[c]	139,000	154,000[c]	175,000
Farm[b]	55,151	46,100[a]	42,000	39,000[c]	35,000	33,000[c]	31,000
Fresno Metropolitan Area	171,136[a]	247,557[a]	297,000	349,000	410,000	479,000[c]	555,000[c]
Urbanized	130,592	211,345	260,000	313,000	374,000[c]	446,000[c]	528,000
Non-urbanized	40,544[a]	36,212[a]	37,000	36,000	35,000[c]	32,000[c]	27,000
Non-metropolitan Fresno County	105,379[a]	118,388[a]	123,000	130,000	139,000	154,000[c]	179,000[c]
TOTAL Fresno County	276,515	365,945	420,000	479,000	549,000	632,000	733,000
	AS PER CENT OF FRESNO COUNTY						
Fresno Urbanized Area	47.2	57.8	61.8	65.3	68.2	70.6	72.0
Non-urbanized Fresno County	52.8	42.2	38.2	34.7	31.8	29.4	28.0
Non-Farm	32.8[c]	29.6[a]	28.1[c]	26.7[c]	25.3[c]	24.3[c]	23.8
Farm[b]	19.9[c]	12.6[a]	10.0[c]	8.1[c]	6.4[c]	5.2[c]	4.2
Fresno Metropolitan Area	61.9[a]	67.6[a]	70.7	72.9	74.7	75.7	75.7
Urbanized	47.2	57.8[c]	61.8[c]	65.3	68.2[c]	70.6	72.0
Non-urbanized	14.7[a]	9.9[ac]	8.8[c]	7.6	6.4[c]	5.1	3.7
Non-metropolitan Fresno County	38.1[a]	32.4[a]	29.3	27.1	25.3	24.3	24.3
TOTAL Fresno County	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

a - estimated by FCPD from Census data
b - includes rural farm and urban farm
c - Figures do not total due to independent rounding

*Fresno County Planning Commission, Fresno County Population Projections 1960-1985, A mimeographed sheet prepared by the Fresno County Planning Commission (Fresno: Fresno County Planning Commission, 1962), a single page.

of transportation. He concluded that 85 to 95 per cent of students in a proposed district will be drawn from an area within twenty miles of the serving institution.[11]

TABLE IV*

COMPARATIVE TRAVEL MILEAGE

From	To Fresno	To Madera
Dos Palos	57	27.5
Chowchilla	37	15
Madera	22	--
Oakhurst	45	40
Auberry	39	34
Firebaugh	42	26
Raymond	45	23

*California State Automobile Association, Map Yosemite National Park and Parts of the San Joaquin Valley (Los Angeles: California State Automobile Association, 1960).

The California Master Plan Survey Team stated that there is evidence to support placing a junior college in the Madera-Merced Area.[12] After this recommendation was made, Merced formed its own junior college district leaving Madera without possible enrollment support from the north. In comparing the 1980 projected population of Madera and Fresno Counties, the implications are that junior college planning should advance along the lines of area needs in Madera

---

[11]Arnold E. Joyal, Factors Relating to the Establishment and Maintenance of Junior Colleges-with Special Reference to California (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1932), p. 425.

[12]Liaison Committee of the State Board of Education and the Regents of the University of California, op. cit., p. 112.

County and population needs in Fresno County.

Reedley College, although confined to the area of Reedley High School district for its tax base, has established an attendance area by extensive bus transportation to the surrounding communities. Table V presents the high schools in the Reedley College attendance area and the percentages of students from these high school graduating classes attending Reedley College in 1960-1961.

Fresno City College, by the nature of its location, has served the high schools surrounding it and also the communities of Madera County. The high schools it serves and the percentages of students attending from those high schools are given in Table VI.

Full time enrollments at Fresno City College and at Reedley College for a ten year period are presented in Table VII. From Table VII it may be noted that Fresno City College has had an average enrollment gain of 9.8 per cent a year since 1958. This increase is slightly below the Master Plan Survey Team's status quo prediction of 10.31 per cent a year.

Table VIII illustrates population projections for Fresno County by age groups. Of interest is the fifteen to nineteen year age group in which a majority of junior college students fall. This group by the year 1980 will have a predicted increase of 85 per cent or over 4 per cent a year.

TABLE V*

HIGH SCHOOLS SENDING STUDENTS TO REEDLEY COLLEGE 1962

High School	Distance in Miles	Graduating Class 1960-61		
		Enrollment (Current)	% to College	% to R. C.
Caruthers	35	416	42%	12%
Dinuba	7	675	48%	41%
Fowler	13	1,388	49%	21%
Immanuel	1	189	89%	46%
Kingsburg	11	615	71%	30%
Orosi	12	291	57%	14%
Parlier	5	170	65%	50%
Reedley	---	1,080	73%	70%
Sanger	13	1,099	61%	23%
Selma	11	896	67%	44%
Sierra Union	45	528	54%	16%
Washington Union	27	850	32%	5%

*Reedley College, Application for Accreditation (Reedley: Prepared by the Reedley College Faculty, 1962), p. 3.

TABLE VI*

HIGH SCHOOLS SENDING STUDENTS TO
FRESNO CITY COLLEGE 1962

Fresno City Unified School District	Miles From FCC	Current Enrollment Total	Current Enrollment Sr. Class	% of Graduates Going to Col.	% of Graduates Going to FCC
Bullard High School	5	1,229	266	80%	28%
Edison High School	3	1,066	186	25%	33%
Fresno High School	0	2,006	630	65%	32%
McLane High School	3	2,322	674	70%	33%
Roosevelt High School	4	2,162	635	53%	32%
Other High Schools					
Caruthers Union	17	400	81	30%	17%
Central Union	10	921	188	20%	32%
Chowchilla Union	38	710	150	65%	18%
Clovis Union	12	1,390	280	60%	25%
Dos Palos Union	54	873	170	35%	4%
Fowler Union	10	464	84	50%	9%
Kerman Union	17	456	81	25%	21%
Kingsburg Joint Union	22	591	125	71%	2%
LeGrand Union	51	280	57	45%	10%
Madera Union	21	1,819	334	65%	20%
Riverdale Joint Union	26	393	91	30%	1%
Sanger Union	15	1,083	202	60%	16%
San Joaquin Memorial	1	781	158	80%	46%
Selma Union	16	855	150	40%	6%
Sierra Joint Union	40	530	93	55%	17%
Tranquillity Union	33	469	86	50%	3%
Washington Union	7	809	134	41%	17%
TOTALS		21,609	4,855		

*Fresno City College, Application for Accreditation (Fresno: Prepared by the Fresno City College Faculty, 1962), p. 8.

TABLE VII*

FULL-TIME ENROLLMENTS
FRESNO CITY COLLEGE AND REEDLEY COLLEGE

	Fresno	Reedley
1952-53	560	414
1953-54	649	448
1954-55	875	567
1955-56	975	634
1956-57	1,113	632
1957-58	1,288	719
1958-59	1,699	837
1959-60	1,680	685
1960-61	2,043	672
1961-62	2,125	791

*California State Department of Education, October Reports, (Obtained at the Central School Offices of Fresno, Madera, Merced, Kings and Tulare Counties. 1952-1962).

Explanation of Method

A major purpose of this study is the prediction of junior college enrollments in the Fresno regional junior college area from 1963 to 1980. Such prediction will give an indication of future enrollments and the approximate areas which will need junior college facilities in the future.

One of the basic techniques for predicting junior college attendance is the extension of present high school and elementary school student enrollments into higher grades. In order to accomplish an accurate result from this grade progression technique, a ratio must be established to determine how many students in a given high school district will progress to the next higher grade in that high school district.

TABLE VIII*

FRESNO COUNTY AGE PROJECTIONS

	1960		1965		1970		1975		1980	
	Pop.	Percent	Pop.	Percent	Pop.	Percent	Pop.	Percent	Pop.	Percent
Total	365,945	100.00	420,000	100.00	479,000	100.00	549,000	100.00	632,000	100.00
0 - 4	43,229	11.81	43,900	10.45	49,100	10.24	59,600	10.85	70,400	11.14
5 - 9	41,917	11.45	46,600	11.10	49,200	10.26	54,500	9.93	65,900	10.42
10 - 14	38,454	10.51	46,200	11.00	50,100	10.46	52,700	9.59	58,300	9.23
15 - 19	29,138	7.96	40,400	9.62	47,400	9.90	51,600	9.40	54,700	8.65
20 - 24	21,923	5.99	30,700	7.31	41,900	8.75	48,900	8.91	53,700	8.49
25 - 29	22,254	6.08	25,100	5.97	33,200	6.94	45,000	8.20	52,500	8.31
30 - 34	24,033	6.57	24,000	5.71	26,900	5.62	35,500	6.47	47,800	7.57
35 - 39	25,930	7.09	25,300	6.02	25,300	5.29	28,300	5.16	37,200	5.89
40 - 44	23,435	6.40	26,800	6.38	26,300	5.48	26,200	4.77	29,300	4.63
45 - 49	21,430	5.86	23,900	5.70	27,500	5.75	27,100	4.94	27,000	4.28
50 - 54	17,727	4.84	22,100	5.27	24,200	5.06	28,100	5.12	27,700	4.38
55 - 59	14,854	4.06	17,800	4.24	21,900	4.58	24,300	4.43	28,200	4.46
60 - 64	12,119	3.31	14,300	3.41	17,400	3.64	21,500	3.92	23,800	3.77
65 - 69	10,934	2.99	11,400	2.71	13,500	2.81	16,500	3.00	20,500	3.24
70 - 74	8,682	2.37	9,200	2.18	10,200	2.12	12,100	2.20	14,900	2.36
75 - 79	5,596	1.53	6,500	1.55	7,500	1.56	8,400	1.52	10,000	1.59
80 - 84	2,715	0.74	3,800	.90	4,500	.94	5,200	.95	5,900	.93
85+	1,575	0.43	2,000	.48	2,900	.60	3,500	.64	4,200	.66
0 - 17	142,597	38.97	164,700	39.22	178,700	37.32	198,600	36.18	228,500	36.15
18 - 64	193,846	52.97	222,500	52.96	261,800	54.65	304,800	55.51	348,000	55.07
65+	29,502	8.06	32,800	7.82	38,500	8.03	45,600	8.31	55,500	8.78
14 - 64	219,069	59.86	258,700	61.59	302,000	63.04	346,700	63.15	392,000	62.02

*Fresno County Planning Commission, Fresno County Age Projections 1960-1980, A mimeographed sheet prepared by the Fresno County Planning Commission (Fresno: Fresno County Planning Commission, 1962), a single page.

This method was used in predicting junior college enrollments in the following high school districts: (a) Fresno County--Caruthers, Central Union, Clovis Unified, Fowler, Fresno City Unified, Kerman, Kingsburg, Laton, Parlier, Reedley, Sanger, Selma, Sierra, and Washington; (b) Madera County--Chowchilla and Madera; (c) Merced County--Dos Palos; (d) Tulare County--Dinuba.

The first step in deriving a ratio of progression from one grade to the next in these individual high school districts was the obtaining of a total enrollment for each elementary and each high school grade within the high school district for a seven year period, beginning in 1955-56 and ending in 1961-62. Two totals were then established by adding each grade in the following way: Total I was arrived at by adding the attendance totals for each grade for each year from 1955-56 to 1960-61; Total II was deduced by adding these yearly attendance totals from 1956-57 to 1961-62.

The next step in determining the progression ratio was the division of Total I of the preceding year by Total II in the succeeding year. This division was carried out for all grades and thus a grade progression ratio was established for each grade.

The third step involved the multiplication of the individual grade enrollments for 1961-62. The first grade ratio was multiplied by the first grade enrollment. The result was then transferred to the second grade column

where it was multiplied by the second grade progression ratio. In addition to multiplying the grade one progression enrollment for 1962-63, the grade two current enrollment for 1961-62 was multiplied by the grade two progression ratio. This process was continued until the 1961-62 first grade enrollment had progressed to the year 1973.

The fourth step in predicting enrollments to 1980 involved taking the average enrollment increase in the first grade for a seven year period and adding this average to the 1961-62 enrollment for the predicted 1962-63 enrollment. This process was continued to the year 1968-69. In this way a base figure was established to which the grade progression ratios could be applied to the year 1980.

The progression ratios of 48.95 of twelfth graders going into the thirteenth grade and 51.35 of thirteenth graders going into the fourteenth grade were established by the California State Department of Education for the Fresno regional junior college area.[13]

Applying the Method

The grade progression method was then applied to the high schools in the following attendance areas: Fresno City College, Reedley College, and the Madera area. High schools

---

[13]California State Department of Education, A Survey of a Proposed Junior College District in the Fresno, Madera, Kings, Merced, and Tulare Counties (Sacramento: Bureau of School District Organization, Mimeographed Copy, 1962), p. 8.

were assigned to Reedley or Fresno College areas because of prior attendance patterns. Madera, Chowchilla, and Dos Palos high schools were assigned to Madera because of area need. The assignments are listed as follows:

Fresno	Reedley	Madera
Central	Caruthers	Chowchilla
Clovis	Dinuba	Dos Palos
Fresno City Unified	Fowler	Madera
Kerman	Kingsburg	
Sanger ½	Laton	
Sierra ½	Parlier	
Washington Union	Reedley	
	Sanger ½	
	Selma	
	Sierra ½	

The number of students attending junior colleges from these individual high school districts was then computed for each year to 1980 for each designated attendance area. Totals for the three areas thus individually obtained were then compiled by year for the entire study area up to and including 1980.

This progression ratio method in effect extends from the first grade and subsequent grades to the year 1980. In this present status projection no allowance is made for increased birth rates, immigrations or ratio change. Table III shows the growth in numbers and percentages by age groups from 1965 to 1980 for Fresno County. It indicates an increase in births and immigrations.[14]

---

[14]Fresno County Planning Commission, Fresno County Age Projections 1960-1980, A mimeographed sheet prepared by the Fresno County Planning Commission (Fresno: Fresno County Planning Commission, 1962), Single Page.

In addition to the above mentioned present status projection, two other projections are used. They are the status quo projections and the modified projections which were prepared by the California Department of Finance for the Master Plan Survey Team.[15]

The Master Plan Survey Team, after its thorough study of junior college enrollments, became convinced that lower division enrollment increase should be highest in the junior colleges. Their status quo projections are based upon the following assumptions:

1. Easy accessibility to students and the consequent reduction in cost to them.
2. The high scholastic records made in both the state colleges and the university by junior college transfers.
3. The junior college screening function of indicating those students most likely to succeed in their education beyond the lower division.
4. The adopted policy for the university and the state colleges to place increased emphasis on upper division and graduate programs.
5. The diversion of a portion of lower division students from the state colleges and the University of California to the junior colleges to aid in controlling the unmanageable size of certain institutions.
6. Costs per student to the state for both operation and plant are lower in the junior colleges than in the state colleges and the university.[16]

The status quo projection in Table IX predicts that there will be 176 per cent increase in junior college

---

[15]Liaison Committee of the State Board of Education and the Regents of the University of California, op. cit., pp. 47-57.

[16]Ibid., p. 58.

enrollments between 1958 and 1975. In essence this is 276 students enrolled in 1975 for every one hundred students enrolled in 1958.[17] This would mean a 10.35 per cent increase per year of the 1958 full-time junior college enrollments. Projection percentage increases by year are presented in Table IX.

TABLE IX

CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGE STATUS QUO PROJECTIONS (PERCENTAGE* INCREASE BY YEAR OVER 1958 ENROLLMENTS)

1958	1964--62	1970--124	1976--186
1959--10	1965--72	1971--135	1977--196
1960--21	1966--83	1972--145	1978--207
1961--31	1967--93	1973--155	1979--217
1962--41	1968--104	1974--166	1980--228
1963--52	1969--114	1975--176	

*Percentages are rounded to nearest whole number.

For the purposes of this study the percentage progression increase for the status quo was continued to and included the year 1980.

The Master Plan Survey Team after studying the status quo enrollment projections asked the Department of Finance to prepare a modified projection of junior college enrollments for the following reasons:

1. That diversion of full-time lower division students from State Colleges and University of California campuses to junior colleges will be undertaken so as to result in approximately 50,000 such students being diverted in 1975;
2. That the respective boards of the State College System and the University of California will

---

[17] Ibid., p. 55.

devise measures that will reduce the overcrowding of certain of their institutions beyond reasonable site capacity and will increase the numbers attending less crowded institutions of both systems;

3. That the lower division proportion of full-time undergraduate enrollment of the two public segments will be reduced gradually so that by 1975 it will be, for each segment, in the neighborhood of 41 per cent. This would be, in each case, a system-wide average, not necessarily true for each campus within the system;
4. That the most rapid rate of lower division growth during the period 1960 to 1975 will be in the junior colleges, since this segment is least costly, per student, to the state;
5. That during this period, in addition to the already authorized state college and state university campuses, two new state colleges, will be established and put into operation;
6. That the state will encourage development by local communities or additional junior colleges as needed, contributing more heavily to their support than in the past and making state funds available to pay for part of the cost of their construction;
7. That the modification of freshman entrance requirements to state colleges and the University of California, as recommended . . . will be adopted, as well as those modifications affecting entrance to those institutions with advanced standing.[18]

The modified projection in Table X assumes that there will be 224 per cent increase in junior college enrollments between 1958 and 1975. In essence this is 324 students in 1975 for every one hundred students enrolled in 1958. This would mean a 13.17 per cent increase per year of the 1958 full-time junior college enrollments.[19] Projection

---

[18] Ibid., pp. 60-61.

[19] Ibid.

percentages increases by year are presented in Table X. For the purpose of this study the percentage progression increase for the modified projection was continued to and included the year 1980.

TABLE X

CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGE MODIFIED PROJECTIONS
(PERCENTAGE* INCREASE BY YEAR OVER 1958 ENROLLMENTS)

1958	1964--79	1970--158	1976--237
1959--13	1965--92	1971--171	1977--250
1960--26	1966--105	1972--184	1978--263
1961--40	1967--119	1973--198	1979--276
1962--53	1968--132	1974--211	1980--289
1963--66	1969--145	1975--224	

*Percentages are rounded to nearest whole number.

To apply the status quo and modified projections to this study, a 1958 enrollment figure for each of the attendance areas was obtained. These 1958 attendance area figures were computed by applying the grade progression ratios for grades thirteen and fourteen to each 1958 high school graduating class in the study area.

Projection findings

As previously mentioned in this chapter, the present status projection in Table XI must be considered a conservative projection. Even so, the projection indicates that by 1975 there will be two hundred students to every one hundred students enrolled in 1958.

An analysis by attendance areas indicates that by 1975 Madera will have 136 students for every one hundred

TABLE XI

PRESENT STATUS PROJECTION 1963-1980
FRESNO REGIONAL JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT

YEAR	FRESNO*	MADERA*	REEDLEY*	TOTAL FOR DISTRICT
1963-64	2356.50	492.48	738.25	3586.73
1964-65	2500.91	508.05	763.57	3772.53
1965-66	2763.42	509.35	814.68	4087.45
1966-67	2937.75	535.32	872.68	4345.75
1967-68	3041.89	561.74	867.76	4471.39
1968-69	3150.12	522.77	873.20	4546.09
1969-70	3226.18	537.04	883.79	4647.01
1970-71	3391.65	534.33	926.25	4852.23
1971-72	3594.41	540.58	928.84	5063.83
1972-73	3891.78	546.43	962.01	5400.22
1973-74	3865.68	542.52	1013.33	5421.53
1974-75	3815.08	555.09	1044.25	5414.42
1975-76	3968.10	563.95	1066.67	5598.72
1976-77	4042.78	573.72	1092.50	5709.00
1977-78	4234.72	583.58	1116.85	5935.15
1978-79	4368.23	593.17	1140.83	6102.23
1979-80	4502.23	602.90	1164.54	6269.67

*Fresno area is composed of the following high schools: Central Union, Clovis Unified, Fresno Unified, Kerman, Washington Union, ½ of Sanger, ½ of Sierra Union, ½ of Fowler.

*Madera area is composed of the following high schools: Chowchilla, Dos Palos and Madera.

*Reedley area is composed of the following high schools: Caruthers, Dinuba, Kingsburg, Laton, Parlier, Reedley, Selma, ½ of Fowler, ½ of Sanger and ½ of Sierra Union.

students enrolled in 1958; that Fresno will have 238 students for every one hundred students enrolled in 1958; and that Reedley will have 155 students for every one hundred students enrolled in 1958. This projection result is less than that of the status quo projection of 276 students enrolled in 1975 for every one hundred students enrolled in 1958 and the modified projection of 324 students enrolled in 1975 for every one hundred students enrolled in 1958.

The findings of the present status projections show that the school population growth in the Fresno area far exceeds that of Madera and Reedley. Table III, page 83, indicates that from 1960 to 1975 the population in the Fresno metropolitan area will increase by 187 per cent. This growth is greater than the 177 per cent California average which is the basis for the status quo projection.[20] Fresno's past population growth of over 5 per cent a year has been more than that of either Los Angeles or San Francisco.[21] Los Angeles in turn has a junior college student growth prediction from 1958 to 1975 of 224 per cent.[22] Because of this data, it must be assumed that Fresno will follow more closely the status quo projections as tabulated in Table XII.

---

[20] Ibid., p. 101.

[21] Bogue and Beale, op. cit., p. 873.

[22] Liaison Committee of the State Board of Education and the Regents of the University of California, op. cit., p. 101.

Attendance projections for junior college students in the Madera area are influenced by the predictions of the Master Plan as follows:

> The one area that is estimated to have fewer public high school graduates in 1975 than in 1957-58 is Area 6 (Madera, Kings and Tulare Counties) which according to projections will decrease from 2502 in 1957-58 to 2300 in 1975 or by eight per cent.[23]

Although the present status projection does not show a decrease in Madera's school population, increasing automation on the farm and corporate farming will have a negative influence on the general population growth.

It must be assumed from the data presented that Madera will closely follow the present status projections indicated in Table XI.

An analysis of the Reedley attendance area may be made by referring to Table III on page 83. Table III indicates that the predicted growth for non-metropolitan Fresno County, which includes most of the Reedley attendance area, will be 21,000 people between 1960-1975 or a 16 per cent growth in fifteen years or less than one per cent growth per year.

The Master Plan Survey Team described future student growth in the San Joaquin Valley, including Fresno and Bakersfield as follows:

> . . . public high school graduates from the entire San Joaquin Valley--San Joaquin County south to and

---

[23] Ibid.

TABLE XII

STATUS QUO PROJECTIONS*
FRESNO REGIONAL JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT 1958-1980

YEAR	FRESNO*	MADERA*	REEDLEY*	TOTAL FOR DISTRICT
1958-59	1599.92	406.08	668.32	2674.32
1959-60	1759.91	446.68	735.15	2941.74
1960-61	1935.90	491.35	808.66	3235.91
1961-62	2095.89	531.96	875.49	3503.34
1962-63	2255.88	572.57	942.33	3770.07
1963-64	2431.87	617.24	1015.84	4064.95
1964-65	2591.87	657.84	1082.68	4332.39
1965-66	2751.86	698.45	1149.51	4599.82
1966-67	2927.85	743.12	1289.86	4960.83
1967-68	3087.84	783.73	1363.37	5234.34
1968-69	3263.83	828.40	1430.20	5522.43
1969-70	3423.82	869.01	1497.03	5789.86
1970-71	3583.82	909.61	1570.55	6063.98
1971-72	3759.81	954.28	1637.38	6351.47
1972-73	3919.80	994.89	1704.21	6618.90
1973-74	4079.79	1035.50	1777.73	6893.02
1974-75	4255.78	1080.17	1844.56	7180.51
1975-76	4415.77	1120.78	1911.39	7447.94
1976-77	4575.77	1161.38	1978.21	7715.36
1977-78	4735.76	1201.99	2051.74	7989.49
1978-79	4895.75	1246.66	2118.57	8260.98
1979-80	5071.74	1287.27	2192.08	8551.09

*These projections are based upon the California Master Plan projections for Junior College of 10.35 per cent per year.

including Kern County will increase, according to projections by only 42 per cent during this period . . .[24]

The 36 per cent increase from 1958-1975 shown by the present status projection in Table XI for the Reedley area must be assumed to be the most accurate projection for the Reedley area.

Table XIII represents the findings of this study based on all known evidence available. The Fresno area is calculated on the Master Plan status quo projection and the Reedley Madera areas on the present status projections following the findings of this study.

Innumerable factors may change these projections. One of the most important of these factors is the ratio of high school graduates going on to junior college.

Allen and Briscoe computed their progression ratios for Orange County on a 60 per cent ratio and they considered this a conservative ratio![25] The ratio of 48.95 per cent was used for this study.[26] Although increased birth rates and immigration may materially change the present progression tables, an ever increasing trend among high school graduates

---

[24]Ibid.

[25]Hollis P. Allen and William S. Briscoe, A Study of the Junior College Needs of Orange County 1960-1980 (Santa Ana: Orange County Committee of School District Organization, 1960), p. 24.

[26]California State Department of Education, A Survey of a Proposed Junior College District in the Fresno, Madera, Kings, and Tulare Counties (Sacramento: Bureau of School District Organization, Mimeographed Copy, 1962), p. 8.

TABLE XIII*

LOW ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS 1963-1980
FRESNO REGIONAL JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT

YEAR	FRESNO	MADERA	REEDLEY	TOTAL FOR DISTRICT
1963-64	2431.87	492.48	738.25	3662.60
1964-65	2591.87	508.05	763.57	3863.49
1965-66	2751.86	509.35	814.68	4075.89
1966-67	2927.85	535.32	872.68	4335.85
1967-68	3087.34	561.74	867.76	4516.84
1968-69	3263.83	522.77	873.20	4659.80
1969-70	3423.82	537.04	883.79	4844.65
1970-71	3583.82	534.33	926.25	5044.40
1971-72	3759.81	540.58	928.84	5229.23
1972-73	3919.80	546.43	962.01	5428.24
1973-74	4079.79	542.52	1013.33	5635.64
1974-75	4255.78	555.09	1044.25	5855.12
1975-76	4415.77	563.95	1066.67	6046.39
1976-77	4575.77	573.72	1092.50	6241.99
1977-78	4735.76	583.58	1116.85	6436.19
1978-79	4895.75	593.17	1140.83	6629.75
1979-80	5071.74	602.90	1164.54	6839.91

*This table is based upon the status quo projections for Fresno and the present status projections for Madera and Reedley.

to attend college may be the biggest factor in modifying the projections. Table XIV presents the modified or highest projections for the study area. Table XV presents a high projection for the study area consisting of the Master Plan Survey Team's modified projections for the Fresno area and the status quo projections for the Reedley-Madera areas. This high projection may be followed if future ratios of high school graduates entering college increase in the study area as they have in Southern California.

Additional campus needs

One of the first considerations of the proposed Fresno Regional Junior College District should be the establishment of an additional campus in the Madera area. The establishment of a junior college in that vicinity would meet the recommendations made by the California Master Plan in fulfilling the higher educational needs of the Chowchilla, Madera and Dos Palos High School Districts.[27]

The findings of this study indicate that a Madera area junior college would start with an enrollment of 492 students in 1963-64 and would increase to 555 students by 1975. This is well within the Master Plan recommendation that once established, a junior college should reach an enrollment of

---

[27]Liaison Committee of the State Board of Education and the Regents of the University of California, op. cit., p. 112.

TABLE XIV*

MODIFIED PROJECTIONS
FRESNO REGIONAL JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT 1958-1980

YEAR	FRESNO	MADERA	REEDLEY	TOTAL FOR DISTRICT
1958-59	1599.92	406.08	668.32	2674.32
1959-60	1807.90	458.87	755.20	3021.97
1960-61	2015.89	511.66	842.08	3336.96
1961-62	2239.88	568.51	935.64	3744.03
1962-63	2447.87	621.13	1022.52	4091.52
1963-64	2655.86	674.09	1109.41	4439.36
1964-65	2863.85	726.88	1196.29	4787.02
1965-66	3071.84	779.67	1283.17	5134.68
1966-67	3279.83	832.46	1370.05	5482.34
1967-68	3503.82	889.31	1463.62	5856.75
1968-69	3711.81	942.10	1550.50	6204.41
1969-70	3919.80	994.89	1637.38	6552.07
1970-71	4127.79	1047.68	1724.26	6899.73
1971-72	4335.78	1100.47	1811.14	7247.39
1972-73	4543.77	1153.76	1898.02	7595.05
1973-74	4767.76	1210.11	1991.59	7969.46
1974-75	4975.75	1262.90	2078.47	8317.12
1975-76	5183.74	1315.69	2165.35	8664.78
1976-77	5391.73	1368.48	2252.23	9012.44
1977-78	5599.72	1421.28	2339.12	9360.12
1978-79	5807.70	1474.07	2426.00	9707.77
1979-80	6015.69	1526.86	2512.88	10055.43

*These projections are based upon the California Master Plan projections for junior colleges of 13.17 per cent increase per year.

TABLE XV*

HIGH ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS 1963-1980
FRESNO REGIONAL JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT

YEAR	FRESNO	MADERA	REEDLEY	TOTAL FOR DISTRICT
1958-59	1599.92	406.08	668.32	2674.32
1959-60	1807.90	446.68	735.15	2989.73
1960-61	2015.89	491.35	808.66	3315.90
1961-62	2239.88	531.96	815.49	3587.33
1962-63	2447.87	572.57	942.33	3962.77
1963-64	2655.86	617.84	1015.84	4289.54
1964-65	2863.85	657.84	1082.68	4604.37
1965-66	3071.84	698.45	1149.51	4919.80
1966-67	3279.83	743.12	1289.86	5312.81
1967-68	3503.82	783.73	1363.37	5650.92
1968-69	3711.81	828.40	1430.20	5970.41
1969-70	3919.80	869.01	1497.03	6285.84
1970-71	4127.79	909.61	1570.55	6607.95
1971-72	4335.78	954.28	1637.38	6927.44
1972-73	4543.77	999.89	1704.21	7247.87
1973-74	4767.76	1035.50	1777.73	7580.99
1974-75	4975.75	1080.17	1844.56	7900.48
1975-76	5183.74	1120.78	1911.39	8215.87
1976-77	5391.73	1161.38	1978.21	8531.32
1977-78	5599.72	1201.99	2051.74	8853.45
1978-79	5807.70	1246.66	2118.57	9172.43
1979-80	6015.69	1287.27	2192.08	9495.04

*This table is based upon the modified projections for Fresno and the status quo projections for Madera and Reedley.

400 in from seven to ten years. The full-time enrollment recommendations made by the Master Plan Survey Team are:[28]

Minimum	Optimum	Maximum
400	3,500	6,000

Joyal found the following minimum standards applicable in the establishment of a junior college.

1. An area of maximum radius from the proposed junior college of twenty miles.
2. A minimum high school A. D. A. within the proposed district of 1250.
3. A minimum of 200 junior college A. D. A. is necessary to provide enough students to furnish registrants for the absolute minimum number of courses offered as a curriculum in a California junior college. (If the offering of the smallest junior college in California be used as a criterion, there should be enrolled a minimum of at least 333 students.)
4. A minimum of eight full-time teachers, exclusive of administrative or supervisory officers.
5. A minimum offering of 120 periods of work per week, in no fewer than twenty courses per semester.[29]

The establishment of a junior college in the Madera area could very well meet these criteria.

The future growth of Reedley College as indicated in Table XI of this study will be a gradual increase of 36 per cent or 1044 students by 1975. Present facilities are capable of accommodating 1100 students.[30] Campus expansion, to the

---

[28] Ibid., p. 111.

[29] Joyal, op. cit., p. 426.

[30] California State Department of Education. A preliminary Survey of Proposed junior college districts to be composed of twenty-two high school districts in Kings, Madera, Fresno and Tulare Counties (Sacramento: State Department of Education, Mimeographed Copy, 1962), p. 4.

maximum of 6500 enrolled, could be handled on the present eighty-nine acres; Reedley College has an option to buy an additional sixty-three contiguous acres.

Fresno City College will reach its maximum enrollment of 4250[31] by 1975 on the low enrollment projection and by 1972 according to the high enrollment projections.

Steps should be taken as early as 1965 to secure an additional junior college site in the Fresno metropolitan area. Any period of time less than four years from initial planning to occupation and operation must be considered a crash program in developing a junior college.[32]

The selection of the three college areas on which to base these projections was made by noting the traditional attendance patterns for the Reedley and Fresno areas and the area need of Madera.

Although the present status projection may be a fairly accurate prediction for the Madera and Reedley areas, a more likely projection for the Fresno area, because of greater population growth, is the status quo projection. These two projections are combined in Table XIII.

Immediate planning for the proposed Fresno Regional

---

[31] Ibid.

[32] Sacramento County Committee on School District Organization, A preliminary study on Junior College organization in Sacramento County (Sacramento: County Committee on School District Organization, 1961), p. 22.

Junior College District may follow the low projections in Table XIII as a minimum enrollment prediction for the district. Maximum planning may progress along the high enrollment projection as shown in Table XV.

A minimum of 6,839 students and a maximum of 9,495 students by 1980 for the Fresno Regional Junior College District is the projection of this study.

Many factors have influenced these projections, not the least being the increase in California's population which, if predictions hold true, will double by 1980.

Fresno County will grow 1.7 times its present size although most of this growth will be in the Fresno metropolitan area which will have 75 per cent of the growth predicted for the entire county.

The high projection indicated in Table XV is based upon the factor of more high school graduates attending junior college in the future. This may be an important factor for consideration once the district is formed.

Of great importance should be the consideration of the immediate locating of a junior college in the Madera area and the planning of an additional Fresno area campus to be completed not later than 1975.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. SUMMARY

Restatement of problem. It was the purpose of this study to explore the factors which influence junior college attendance, (2) to predict the junior college enrollments for the entire study area, by year, from 1963 to 1980, (3) to predict the enrollments for the three individual attendance areas, by year, from 1963 to 1980, (4) to propose the date and general location of additional junior colleges in the study area.

Methods used. For the purposes of this project, each high school district in the study area was assigned to one of the following junior college attendance areas: Fresno, Madera and Reedley. Three different projections were used to determine future enrollments in these districts. They were the present status projection, the status quo projection and the modified status projection. By these methods a high and a low projection were made for the study area.

The present status projection, which projected present enrollments to 1980, was made for each individual high school district. The status quo projection, which allowed 10.35 per cent growth per year from 1958 to 1975, was extended to include the year 1980. This 10.35 per cent per year was

applied to the three study areas by year from 1958 to 1980. The same process used for the status quo projection was also used for the modified status projection; instead of the 10.35 per cent per year increase used in the status quo projection, a 13.17 per cent increase per year was used. The status quo and modified status projections were used by the California Master Plan Survey Team.

The factors influencing junior college attendance were then considered in developing a high and a low projection for the study area. The low projection result for the study area was obtained by combining the status quo projection for the Fresno area with the present status projection for the Madera and Reedley areas. The high projection result for the entire study area was achieved by combining the modified status projection for the Fresno area with the status quo projection for the Madera and Reedley areas.

Summation of study. The evolution of the junior college is without precedent in the history of higher education. In fifty years it has grown from an idea expressed by President Harper of the University of Chicago to 600 institutions enrolling over 800,000 students. Its rapid growth can be related to its democratic functions which have been born out of practical needs of the community for higher education. These practical functions are the preparatory function, the terminal function, the general education function, the guidance function, and the adult education function.

California, cognizant of the importance of higher education for all its citizens, has authorized four studies in higher education since World War II. The first three--A Survey of the Needs of California in Higher Education, A Restudy of the Needs of California in Higher Education, and The Need for Additional Centers of Public Higher Education in California--did much in pointing out the growing needs for higher education in California. These studies were culminated in the fourth study, The California Master Plan for Higher Education.

The implementation of the Master Plan will cover the entire state with centers of higher education, consisting of branches of the University of California, state colleges and junior colleges.

One of the greatest innovations of the Master Plan was the policy enacted by the legislature stating that all high school and unified districts shall be included in a junior college district.

This legislation culminated fifty years of junior college legislation in California. The first legislation that permitted the establishment of the state's oldest junior college in Fresno led to later legislation that lent state funds to junior colleges. Later legislation prescribed criteria for establishment and standards by which to operate junior colleges. The growth of the junior college in California has been directly related to California's population

growth and the establishment of an industrial community.

The mild California climate has pulled millions of people into the state. From 1900 to 1950 California's population increased 600 per cent. By 1975 California will have a predicted population of 25.6 million people. This growth will make California the largest state in the union and by the year 2020 it will have a predicted population of 58,000,000 people.

This unparalleled population growth has had, and will continue to have a tremendous effect on state and local educational planning.

The influence of this population enlargement on the area under study is shown as follows: The Fresno metropolitan area, because of industrialization related to agribusiness and its centrally located position in the state, will grow much faster than the Reedley or Madera area. Population projections indicate that Fresno will grow at the rate of 1.87 times its present size which will be greater than the growth predicted for the rest of the state.

The Madera area which had a 9.5 per cent increase in population between 1950 and 1960 will continue to average a 1 per cent increase per year to 1980.

The Reedley area which is mostly in the non-metropolitan area of Fresno County will grow approximately 16 per cent from 1960 to 1975.

Because of these different population increase patterns

of the three areas under study, Fresno was considered separately in all enrollment projections. Reedley and Madera, which have almost identical predicted growth patterns, were considered jointly in enrollment projections.

To determine future junior college attendance, factors other than growing populations also had to be considered.

The junior college in California is often called the "community college" because of its proximity to the student. Research has proved that when a junior college is located within a community the high school graduates are more likely to go on to college and are more likely to enroll in a junior college.

The rapid advancement of our economic and technical community has forced a need for the individual to acquire a higher degree of educational competency in order to hold a job. Higher education has become an important factor in safeguarding the upward social mobility of our country. To satisfy these increasing demands for higher education, educators and students alike are turning to the junior college.

A traditional barrier to a college education has been a financial one for many students. A tuition free junior college placed in the proximity of the student has greatly lessened this financial barrier.

The President's commission on higher education has estimated that 49 per cent of the population can benefit from two years of college education. The selection of college

entrants on a strict academic and intellectual capacity basis has eliminated many students from higher education who could benefit from a terminal and semi-professional course.

The junior college, by offering these terminal and semi-professional courses, is filling the gap in the higher educational system.

II. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The implementation of the recommendations of this study will naturally depend upon the acceptance by the electorate of a proposed Fresno Regional Junior College District. Providing that such approval is forthcoming, the following recommendations, based upon the findings of this study, are presented.

One of the findings of this study is that the Fresno area is the fastest growing territory within the proposed junior college district. Fresno will have a minimum projected enrollment of 5,021 students and a maximum of 6,015 students by 1980. Fresno City College, which has a capacity of 4,250 students, will reach its optimum enrollment between 1972 and 1975.

It, therefore, is a recommendation of this study that planning for an additional Fresno area campus be started as early as 1965, in order that such a junior college may be in operation by 1972.

Findings on area needs for the proposed district

indicate that the Madera area, as described in this study, could greatly benefit from the establishment of a community college. Such an institution placed in proximity to eligible students would aid tremendously in a decision to attend college. According to the findings of this study, a predicted enrollment for such a college would be 492 students for 1963-1964 and between 602-1,526 students by 1980. Consequently, a second recommendation of this study is that a junior college be established in the Madera area in the very near future. It is hereby pointed out that such a recommendation for the Madera area has also been made by the California Master Plan Survey Team.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Allen, Hollis P. and William S. Briscoe. A Study of the Junior College Needs of Orange County 1960-1980. Santa Ana: Orange County Committee of School District Organization, 1960.

Beale, Calvin and Donald J. Bogue. Economic Areas of the United States. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961.

Bogue, Jessie Parker. The Community College. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1950.

California Education Code. St. Paul: West Publishing Company, 1959.

California Statutes. Sacramento: California State Printing Office, 1961

California Vocational Education Staff. Vocational Education in California. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1945.

Deutsch, Monroe E., Aubrey A. Douglas and George D. Strayer. A Report of a Survey of the Needs of California in Higher Education. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1948.

Diekoff, John S. Democracy's College. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.

Economic Development Agency. California Statistical Abstracts. Sacramento: Printing Division, Document Section, 1961.

Educational Policies Commission. Higher Education in a Decade of Decision. Washington, D. C.: National Educational Association of the United States and the American Association of School Administrators, 1957.

Eells, Walter Crosby. The Junior College. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1931.

Gray, William S. The Junior College Curriculum. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.

Hollingshead, Byron S. Who Should Go to College. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952.

Johnson, B. Lamar. General Education in Action. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1957.

Liaison Committee of the State Board of Education and The Regents of the University of California. A Master Plan for Higher Education in California 1960-1975. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1960.

McConnell, T. R., T. C. Holy and H. H. Semans. A Restudy of the Needs of California in Higher Education. Sacramento: California Department of Education, 1955.

President's Commission on Higher Education. Higher Education for American Democracy. A Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1947.

Proctor, William M. The Junior College Its Organization and Administration. Stanford University: Stanford University Press, 1927.

Seashore, Carl E. The Junior College Movement. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1940.

Semans, H. H. and T. C. Holy. A Study of the Need for Additional Centers of Public Higher Education in California. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1951.

B. PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT

California State Department of Finance. California Population in 1956. Sacramento: Budget Division, Financial Research Section, (July, 1956).

California State Department of Finance, Division of Budgets and Accounts. Geographic Sources of California's College Freshmen, a Graphic Summary. Sacramento: California State Department of Finance, Financial Research Section, (May, 1955).

Office of the Governor of California. California Story. Sacramento: California State Printing Office, 1960.

C. PERIODICALS

Barber, Leroy E. "Why Some Able High School Graduates Do Not Go to College," School Review, LIX (February, 1950), p. 95.

McLane, C. L. "The Junior College or Upward Extension of the High School," School Review, XXI (March, 1913), p. 64.

"Where Will U. S. Put Sixty Million More People?" U. S. News and World Report, XLIII (August 9, 1957), p. 48.

D. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

California State Department of Education October Reports. Obtained at the County School Offices of Fresno, Madera, Merced, Kings, and Tulare Counties. 1952-1962.

California State Department of Education. A Preliminary Survey of a Proposed Junior College District to be Composed of Twenty-Two High School Districts in Kings, Madera, Fresno, and Tulare Counties. Sacramento: State Department of Education, 1962.

Fresno County Planning Commission. Fresno County Population Projections 1960-1985. Fresno: Fresno County Planning Commission, Mimeographed Sheet, 1962.

Reedley College. Application for Accreditation. Reedley: Prepared by the Reedley College Faculty, 1962.

Reedley College Board of Trustees. Reedley College Annual Report 1959-1960. Reedley: Reedley College Board of Trustees, 1960.

Sacramento County Committee on School District Organization. A Preliminary Study on Junior College Organization in Sacramento County. Sacramento: Sacramento County on School District Organization, 1961.

Fresno City College. Application for Accreditation. Fresno: Prepared by the Fresno City College Faculty, 1962.

Fresno County Planning Commission. Fresno County Age Projections 1960-1980. Fresno: Fresno County Planning Commission, Mimeographed Sheet, 1962.

E. THESIS

Joyal, Arnold E. Factors Relating to the Establishment and Maintenance of Junior Colleges with Special Reference to California. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1932.

F. ADDRESSES

Cox, Ronald F. The Proposed Fresno Regional Junior College. An address delivered to high school Boards of Trustees and administrators of Fresno and Madera counties. Fresno: Fresno City College, 1961.

Donahue, Dorothy. The Junior College--Its Problems and Challenges. An address delivered to the California Junior College Association Fall Conference. Yosemite National Park: Mimeographed Copy, 1955.

Kerr, Clark. The California Junior College. An address delivered to the California Junior College Association Fall Conference. Yosemite National Park: Mimeographed Copy, 1961.

Simpson, Roy E. The Future of the Junior College. An address delivered to the California Junior College Association. Yosemite National Park: Mimeographed Copy, 1956.

G. BROCHURES

Fresno County-City Chamber of Commerce. Fresno is the Place. Fresno: Fresno City-County Chamber of Commerce, 1960.

Fresno County-City Chamber of Commerce. World Capital of Agribusiness. Fresno: A report compiled by the Research Department of the Fresno County-City Chamber of Commerce, 1962.

APPENDIX

TABLE XVI*

PRESENT STATUS PROJECTIONS 1963-1980
FOR THE CENTRAL UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

Year	Enrollment by Grade														Total Gr.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	13 & 14
1955-56	435	373	348	335	261	284	311	259	111	90	93	59			
1956-57	419	364	346	336	317	275	315	301	128	97	82	74			
1957-58	449	277	359	343	311	321	255	296	132	110	74	70	36.22		
1958-59	514	400	446	372	361	346	321	238	118	120	94	57	34.26	18.59	52.85
1959-60	479	439	370	388	364	380	333	317	95	111	99	75			
1960-61	544	442	431	354	288	381	384	327	124	92	95	77			
1961-62	488	467	420	419	360	359	368	360	133	109	77	81			
T1	2840	2762	2300	2547	1902	1990	2019	1938	708	620	537	412			
T2	2893	2389	2372	2212	2001	2062	1976	1839	730	639	521	434			
Ratio	84.12	85.88	96.17	78.56	108.41	99.30	91.08	37.67	90.25	84.03	80.82	48.95	51.35		
1961-62	488	467	420	419	360	359	368	360	133	109	77	81			
1962-63	496.83	410.51	401.60	403.91	329.17	390.28	356.49	335.17	135.61	120.03	91.59	62.23	39.65		
1963-64	505.66	417.93	352.55	386.22	317.31	356.85	387.55	324.69	126.26	122.39	100.86	74.02	30.46	20.36	50.82
1964-65	514.49	425.36	358.92	339.05	303.41	344.00	354.35	352.98	122.31	113.95	102.84	81.52	36.23	15.64	51.87
1965-66	523.32	432.79	365.30	345.17	266.36	328.93	341.59	322.74	132.97	110.38	95.75	83.12	39.90	18.60	58.50
1966-67	532.15	440.22	371.68	351.31	271.17	288.76	326.63	311.12	121.58	120.01	92.75	77.39	40.69	20.49	61.18
1967-68	540.98	447.64	378.06	357.44	275.99	293.98	286.74	297.49	117.20	109.73	100.84	74.96	37.88	20.89	58.77
1968-69	549.81	455.07	384.43	363.58	280.80	299.20	291.92	261.16	112.06	105.77	92.21	81.50	36.69	19.45	56.14
1969-70		462.50	390.81	369.71	285.63	304.42	297.11	265.88	98.38	101.13	88.88	74.52	39.89	18.84	58.73
1970-71			397.20	375.84	290.44	309.65	302.29	270.61	100.16	179.04	84.98	71.83	36.48	20.48	56.96
1971-72				381.99	295.26	314.87	307.48	275.33	101.94	90.39	150.45	68.68	35.16	18.73	53.89
1972-73					300.09	320.09	312.67	280.05	103.72	92.00	75.95	121.59	33.62	18.05	51.67
1973-74						325.33	317.85	284.78	105.49	93.61	77.31	61.38	59.52	17.26	76.78
1974-75							323.05	289.50	107.28	95.20	78.66	62.48	30.05	30.56	60.61
1975-76								294.23	109.05	96.82	80.00	63.57	30.58	15.43	46.01
1976-77									110.84	98.42	81.36	64.66	31.12	15.70	46.82
1977-78										100.03	82.70	65.76	31.65	15.98	47.63
1978-79											84.06	66.84	32.19	16.25	48.44
1979-80												67.94	32.72	16.53	49.25

*Projections are based upon the 1955-56--1961-62 enrollments from the Barstow, Biola-Pershing, Figarden, Herndon, Houghton-Kearney, Madison, McKinley-Roosevelt, and Teague Elementary Schools and the Central Union High School District.

TABLE XVII*

PRESENT STATUS PROJECTIONS 1963-1980
FOR THE CLOVIS UNIFIED HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

Year	Enrollment by Grade														Total Gr.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	13 & 14
1955-56	376	334	313	287	249	304	236	294	436	400	360	263			
1956-57	388	346	358	318	310	299	271	243	507	465	363	308			
1957-58	434	382	335	366	348	327	313	302	483	472	403	312	150.76		
1958-59	435	432	383	336	361	362	329	267	543	499	468	348	152.72	77.41	230.13
1959-60	486	440	396	422	373	394	371	354	434	435	398	385			
1960-61	583	489	472	436	443	415	423	400	415	328	298	251			
1961-62	552	575	508	498	453	466	426	442	414	392	304	280			
T1	2702	2423	2262	2165	2084	2101	1943	2302	2818	2599	2290	1967			
T2	2878	2664	2452	2376	2288	2263	2133	2003	2796	2591	2234	1984			
Ratio	98.59	101.20	105.04	105.68	108.59	101.52	103.35	121.46	91.94	85.96	86.64	48.95	51.35		
1961-62	552	575	508	498	453	466	426	442	414	392	304	280			
1962-63	591.60	544.22	531.90	533.60	526.29	491.91	473.08	440.27	536.85	380.63	336.96	263.39	137.06		
1963-64	631.20	583.26	550.75	611.23	563.91	571.50	499.39	488.93	534.75	493.58	327.19	291.94	128.93	70.38	199.31
1964-65	670.80	622.30	590.26	578.51	645.95	612.35	580.19	516.12	593.85	491.65	424.28	283.48	142.90	66.21	209.11
1965-66	710.46	661.34	629.77	620.01	611.37	701.44	621.66	599.63	626.88	545.99	422.62	367.60	138.76	73.38	212.14
1966-67	750.12	700.44	669.28	661.51	655.23	663.89	712.10	642.49	728.31	576.35	469.33	366.16	179.94	71.25	251.19
1967-68	789.78	739.54	708.85	703.01	699.08	711.51	673.28	735.96	780.37	669.61	495.43	406.63	179.24	92.40	271.64
1968-69	829.44	778.64	748.41	744.58	742.94	759.13	722.32	696.56	893.90	717.47	575.60	429.24	199.05	92.05	291.10
1969-70		817.74	787.98	786.13	786.87	806.76	770.67	746.52	846.04	821.85	616.74	498.70	210.11	102.21	312.32
1970-71			827.55	827.69	830.78	854.46	819.02	796.49	906.72	777.85	706.46	534.34	244.11	107.89	352.00
1971-72				869.26	874.70	902.14	867.45	846.46	967.42	833.64	668.64	612.08	261.56	125.35	386.91
1972-73					918.63	949.84	915.85	896.51	1028.11	889.45	716.60	579.31	299.61	134.31	433.92
1973-74						997.54	964.28	946.53	1088.90	945.24	764.57	620.86	283.57	153.85	437.42
1974-75							1012.70	996.58	1149.66	1001.13	812.53	662.42	303.91	145.61	449.52
1975-76								1046.63	1210.45	1057.00	860.57	703.97	324.25	156.06	480.31
1976-77									1271.24	1112.89	908.60	745.60	344.59	166.50	511.09
1977-78										1168.78	959.64	787.21	364.97	176.95	541.92
1978-79											1004.68	831.43	385.34	187.41	572.75
1979-80												870.45	406.98	197.37	604.35

*Projections are based upon the 1955-56--1961-62 enrollments from the Clovis, Dry Creek, Fort Washington and Lincoln, Jefferson, Pinedale, Temperance Kutner Elementary Schools and the Clovis Unified High School District.

TABLE XVIII*

PRESENT STATUS PROJECTIONS 1963-1980
FOR THE FRESNO UNIFIED HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

Year	Enrollment by Grade														Total Gr.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	13 & 14
1955-56	3525	3495	3202	3073	2606	2630	2575	2424	2109	1822	1605	1348			
1956-57	3830	3651	3523	3314	3177	2627	2734	2687	2433	1994	1706	1455			
1957-58	3972	3749	3661	3603	3374	3174	2702	2757	2360	2066	1684	1363	712.39		
1958-59	4184	3859	3758	3750	3632	3388	3242	2770	2672	2408	2125	1645	667.65	365.81	1033.46
1959-60	4412	4246	3863	3841	3798	3712	3541	3265	2683	2653	2310	1918			
1960-61	4465	4357	4183	3935	3814	3777	3774	3570	3352	2645	2564	2070			
1961-62	4430	4335	4342	4141	3941	3890	3854	3806	3619	3150	2510	2391			
T1	24388	23357	22190	21516	20401	19308	18568	17473	15609	13588	11994	9799			
T2	25293	24197	23330	22584	21736	20568	19847	18855	17119	14916	12899	10842			
Ratio	99.22	99.88	101.78	101.02	100.82	102.79	101.55	97.97	95.56	94.93	90.40	48.95	51.35		
1961-62	4430	4335	4342	4141	3941	3890	3854	3806	3619	3150	2510	2391			
1962-63	4580	4395.45	4763.30	4419.29	4183.24	3973.32	3998.53	3913.74	3728.74	3458.32	2990.30	2269.04	1170.39		
1963-64	4730	4544.28	4390.18	4848.09	4464.37	4217.54	4084.18	4060.51	3834.29	3563.18	3282.98	2703.23	1110.70	601.00	1718
1964-65	4880	4693.11	4538.83	4468.33	4897.54	4500.98	4335.21	4147.48	3978.08	3664.05	3382.53	2969.81	1323.23	570.34	1893.57
1965-66	5030	4841.94	4687.48	4619.62	4513.91	4937.70	4626.56	4402.41	4063.29	3801.45	3478.28	3057.81	1453.72	679.48	2133.20
1966-67	5180	4990.77	4836.13	4770.92	4666.74	4550.92	5075.46	4698.27	4313.04	3882.88	3608.71	3144.37	1496.80	746.49	2243.29
1967-68	5330	5139.60	4984.78	4922.21	4819.58	4705.00	4677.89	5154.13	4602.90	4121.54	3686.02	3262.27	1539.17	768.61	2307.78
1968-69	5480	5288.43	5133.43	5073.51	4972.42	4859.10	4836.27	4750.40	5049.50	4398.53	3912.58	3332.16	1596.88	790.36	2387.24
1969-70		5437.26	5282.08	5224.81	5125.26	5013.19	4994.67	4911.23	4653.97	4825.30	4175.52	3536.97	1631.09	819.99	2451.08
1970-71			5430.74	5376.10	5278.10	5167.29	5153.06	5072.09	4811.53	4447.33	4580.66	3774.67	1731.35	837.56	2568.91
1971-72				5527.41	5430.94	5321.38	5311.46	5232.93	4969.13	4597.90	4221.85	4140.92	1847.70	889.05	2736.75
1972-73					5583.79	5475.47	5469.85	5393.79	5126.70	4748.50	4364.79	3816.55	2026.98	948.79	2975.77
1973-74						5629.58	5628.24	5554.63	5284.30	4899.07	4507.75	3945.77	1868.20	1040.09	2908.29
1974-75							5786.65	5715.48	5441.87	5049.68	4650.69	4075.00	1931.45	959.32	2890.77
1975-76								5876.34	5599.46	5200.25	4793.66	4204.22	1994.71	991.80	2986.51
1976-77									5757.05	5350.84	4936.50	4333.47	2057.97	1024.28	3082.25
1977-78										5501.44	5079.55	4462.69	2121.23	1056.77	3178.00
1978-79											5222.52	4591.91	2184.49	1089.25	3273.74
1979-80												4721.16	2247.74	1121.74	3369.48

*Projections are based upon the 1955-56--1961-62 enrollments from the Bullard, Easterby, Scandinavian and Wolters Elementary Schools and the Fresno Unified High School District.

TABLE XIX*

PRESENT STATUS PROJECTIONS 1963-1980
FOR THE KERMAN HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

Year	Enrollment by Grade														Total Gr.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	13 & 14
1955-56	182	159	164	147	140	133	160	139	135	99	80	67			
1956-57	183	180	178	160	168	148	126	154	132	113	79	68			
1957-58	190	177	172	173	150	163	161	125	159	122	91	70	33.28		
1958-59	201	177	159	178	170	144	178	160	143	134	97	77	34.23	17.08	51.31
1959-60	194	176	164	160	172	160	148	158	128	115	103	94			
1960-61	206	172	199	164	172	159	165	137	163	118	84	80			
1961-62	216	191	164	194	144	174	156	168	138	136	101	81			
T1	1156	1041	1036	982	972	907	938	873	860	701	534	456			
T2	1007	1073	1036	1029	976	948	934	902	863	738	555	470			
Ratio	92.82	99.52	99.32	99.39	97.53	102.98	96.16	98.85	85.81	79.17	88.01	48.95	51.35		
1961-62	216	191	164	194	144	174	156	168	138	136	101	81			
1962-63	221.60	200.49	190.08	162.88	192.82	140.44	179.19	150.01	166.07	118.42	107.67	88.89	39.65		
1963-64	227.20	205.69	199.53	188.79	161.89	188.06	144.63	172.31	148.28	142.50	93.75	94.76	43.51	20.36	63.87
1964-65	232.80	210.89	204.70	198.17	187.64	157.89	193.66	139.08	170.33	127.24	112.82	82.51	46.39	22.34	68.73
1965-66	238.40	216.08	209.88	203.31	196.96	183.01	162.60	186.22	137.48	146.16	100.74	99.29	40.39	23.82	64.21
1966-67	244.00	221.28	215.04	208.45	202.07	192.10	188.46	156.36	184.08	117.97	115.71	88.66	48.60	20.74	69.34
1967-68	249.60	226.48	220.22	213.58	207.18	197.19	197.82	181.22	154.56	157.96	93.40	101.84	43.40	24.96	68.36
1968-69	255.20	231.68	225.39	218.72	212.28	202.06	203.07	190.22	179.14	132.63	125.06	82.20	49.85	22.26	72.11
1969-70		236.88	230.57	223.86	217.39	207.04	208.08	195.27	188.03	153.72	105.00	110.07	40.24	25.60	65.84
1970-71			235.74	229.00	222.49	212.02	213.21	200.09	193.02	161.35	121.70	92.41	53.88	20.66	74.54
1971-72				234.14	227.60	216.99	218.34	205.02	197.79	165.63	127.74	107.11	45.23	27.67	72.90
1972-73					232.71	221.98	223.46	209.96	202.66	169.72	131.13	112.42	52.43	23.23	75.66
1973-74						226.96	228.60	214.88	207.54	173.90	134.37	115.41	55.03	26.92	81.95
1974-75							233.72	219.82	212.41	178.09	137.68	118.26	56.49	28.26	84.75
1975-76								224.75	217.29	182.27	140.99	121.17	57.89	29.01	86.90
1976-77									222.17	186.46	144.30	124.09	59.31	29.73	89.04
1977-78										190.64	147.62	127.00	60.74	30.46	91.20
1978-79											150.93	129.92	62.17	31.19	93.36
1979-80												132.83	63.60	31.92	95.52

*Projections are based upon the 1955-56--1961-62 enrollments from the Kerman-Floyd Union and Sun Empire Elementary Schools and the Kerman High School District.

TABLE XX*

PRESENT STATUS PROJECTIONS 1963-1980
FOR THE WASHINGTON UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

Year	Enrollment by Grade														Total Gr.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	13 & 14
1955-56	491	353	307	299	269	244	270	234	199	222	142	117			
1956-57	445	345	354	311	278	254	266	267	281	168	178	123			
1957-58	350	339	354	333	285	264	237	251	261	242	143	147	60.20		
1958-59	435	366	332	354	330	294	276	239	253	229	182	130	71.98	30.91	102.89
1959-60	449	365	359	342	361	339	276	270	228	205	184	151			
1960-61	403	364	374	357	359	377	327	303	269	197	169	160			
1961-62	421	396	370	337	341	341	369	327	268	244	166	134			
T1	2573	2132	2080	1896	1882	1772	1652	1614	1491	1263	998	828			
T2	2503	2175	2143	2034	1954	1869	1751	1657	1560	1285	1022	845			
Ratio	84.53	100.52	97.79	103.06	99.31	98.81	100.30	96.65	86.18	80.92	84.67	48.95	51.35		
1961-62	421	396	370	337	341	341	369	327	268	244	166	134			
1962-63	421	355.87	398.06	361.82	347.31	338.65	336.94	370.11	316.05	230.96	197.44	140.55	65.59		
1963-64	421	355.87	357.72	389.26	372.89	344.91	334.62	337.95	357.71	272.37	186.89	167.17	68.80	33.68	102.48
1964-65	421	355.87	357.72	349.81	401.17	370.32	340.81	335.62	326.63	308.27	220.40	158.24	81.83	35.33	117.16
1965-66	421	355.87	357.72	349.81	360.51	398.40	365.91	341.83	324.38	281.69	249.45	186.61	77.46	42.02	119.48
1966-67	421	355.87	357.72	349.81	360.51	358.02	393.66	367.01	330.38	279.55	227.78	211.21	91.35	39.76	131.11
1967-68	421	355.87	357.72	349.81	360.51	358.02	354.14	394.84	354.72	284.72	226.21	192.86	103.39	46.91	150.30
1968-69	421	355.87	357.72	349.81	360.51	358.02	354.14	355.20	381.61	305.70	230.40	191.53	94.40	53.09	147.49
1969-70		355.87	357.72	349.81	360.51	358.02	354.14	355.20	343.30	328.87	247.37	195.08	93.75	48.47	142.22
1970-71			357.72	349.81	360.51	358.02	354.14	355.20	343.30	295.86	266.12	209.45	95.49	48.14	143.63
1971-72				349.81	360.51	358.02	354.14	355.20	343.30	295.86	239.41	225.32	102.53	49.03	151.56
1972-73					360.51	358.02	354.14	355.20	343.30	295.86	239.41	202.71	110.29	52.65	162.94
1973-74						358.02	354.14	355.20	343.30	295.86	239.41	202.71	99.23	56.63	155.86
1974-75							354.14	355.20	343.30	295.86	239.41	202.71	99.23	50.95	150.18
1975-76								355.20	343.30	295.86	239.41	202.71	99.23	50.95	150.18
1976-77									343.30	295.86	239.41	202.71	99.23	50.95	150.18
1977-78										295.86	239.41	202.71	99.23	50.95	150.18
1978-79											239.41	202.71	99.23	50.95	150.18
1979-80												202.71	99.23	50.95	150.18

*Projections are based upon the 1955-56--1961-62 enrollments from the American Union, Fresno Colony, Orange Center, Pacific Union, Washington Colony and Westport Elementary Schools and the Washington Union High School District.

TABLE XXI*

PRESENT STATUS PROJECTIONS 1963-1980
FOR THE FOWLER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

Year	Enrollment by Grade														Total Gr.	½ T. Gr.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	13 & 14	13 & 14
1955-56	248	208	217	199	182	181	176	150	127	125	86	79				
1956-57	263	219	202	181	189	211	164	161	127	119	109	72				
1957-58	288	233	204	190	192	188	193	173	128	110	107	98	35.24			
1958-59	282	272	236	201	219	211	202	195	130	124	105	85	47.97	18.09	66.06	33.03
1959-60	289	245	260	227	219	203	216	177	151	118	114	97				
1960-61	299	232	242	248	238	221	210	205	121	137	94	94				
1961-62	317	257	226	231	253	243	201	200	154	112	114	84				
T1	1589	1409	1400	1246	1239	1215	1161	1061	784	733	615	525				
T2	1738	1458	1370	1278	1310	1277	1186	1111	811	720	643	530				
Ratio	91.76	97.23	91.29	105.14	103.07	97.61	95.69	76.44	91.84	87.72	86.18	40.95	51.35			
1961-62	317	257	226	231	253	243	201	200	154	112	114	84				
1962-63	328.50	290.88	249.88	206.32	242.87	260.77	237.19	192.34	152.88	141.83	98.25	98.25	41.12			
1963-64	340.00	301.43	282.82	228.12	216.92	250.33	254.54	226.97	147.02	140.40	124.41	84.67	48.09	21.12	69.21	34.60
1964-65	351.50	311.98	293.08	258.19	239.85	223.58	244.35	243.57	173.50	135.02	123.16	107.22	41.45	24.69	66.14	33.07
1965-66	363.00	322.54	303.34	267.55	271.46	247.21	218.24	233.82	186.18	159.34	118.44	106.14	52.48	21.28	73.76	36.88
1966-67	374.50	333.09	313.61	276.91	281.30	279.79	241.30	208.83	178.73	170.99	139.77	102.07	51.96	26.95	78.91	39.45
1967-68	386.00	343.64	323.86	286.29	291.14	289.94	273.10	230.90	159.63	164.15	149.99	120.45	49.96	26.68	76.64	38.32
1968-69	397.50	354.19	334.12	295.65	301.01	300.07	283.01	261.33	176.50	146.60	143.99	129.26	58.96	25.65	84.61	42.30
1969-70		364.75	344.38	305.02	310.85	310.25	292.90	270.81	199.76	162.10	128.60	124.09	63.27	30.28	93.55	46.77
1970-71			354.65	314.38	320.70	320.39	302.84	280.28	207.01	183.46	110.61	110.83	60.74	32.49	93.23	46.61
1971-72				323.76	330.54	330.55	312.73	289.79	214.25	190.12	160.93	95.32	54.25	31.19	85.44	42.76
1972-73					340.40	340.69	322.65	299.25	221.52	196.77	166.77	138.69	46.66	27.86	74.52	37.26
1973-74						350.85	332.55	308.74	228.75	203.44	172.60	143.72	67.89	23.96	91.85	45.92
1974-75							342.46	318.22	236.00	210.08	178.46	148.75	70.35	34.86	105.21	52.60
1975-76								327.70	243.25	216.74	184.28	153.80	72.81	36.12	108.93	54.46
1976-77									250.49	223.40	190.12	158.81	75.29	37.39	112.68	56.34
1977-78										230.05	195.97	163.85	77.74	38.66	116.40	58.20
1978-79											201.80	168.89	80.20	39.92	120.12	61.06
1979-80												173.91	82.67	41.18	123.85	61.92

*Projections are based upon the 1955-56--1961-62 enrollments from the Fowler, Lone Star and Malaga Elementary Schools and the Fowler Union High School District.

TABLE XXII*

PRESENT STATUS PROJECTIONS 1963-1980
FOR THE SANGER HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

Year	Enrollment by Grade														Total Gr.	½ Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	13 & 14	Gr.13 & 14
1955-56	451	346	314	250	267	379	267	264	256	223	196	143				
1956-57	494	385	347	343	277	277	294	280	262	226	192	175				
1957-58	446	374	406	322	338	285	287	289	289	248	191	161	85.83			
1958-59	465	387	387	379	325	348	298	272	312	271	219	166	79.27	44.07	123.34	61.67
1959-60	490	366	354	386	373	333	348	295	288	277	241	196				
1960-61	515	362	389	350	382	369	332	348	313	267	232	216				
1961-62	495	381	392	373	344	384	358	333	348	293	240	202				
T1	2861	2220	2197	2030	1962	1991	1826	1748	1720	1512	1271	1057				
T2	2905	2255	2275	2153	2039	1996	1917	1817	1812	1582	1315	1116				
Ratio	78.82	102.48	98.00	100.44	101.73	96.28	99.51	103.66	91.98	86.97	87.80	48.95	51.35			
1961-62	495	381	392	373	344	384	358	333	348	293	240	202				
1962-63	501.50	390.16	390.45	348.16	374.64	349.95	369.72	356.25	345.19	320.09	254.82	210.72	98.88			
1963-64	508.00	395.28	399.84	382.64	349.69	381.12	336.93	367.91	369.29	317.51	278.38	223.73	103.15	50.77	153.92	76.96
1964-65	514.50	400.41	405.08	391.84	384.32	355.74	366.94	335.23	381.38	339.67	276.14	244.42	109.52	52.97	162.49	81.24
1965-66	521.00	405.52	410.34	396.98	393.56	390.97	342.51	365.14	347.55	350.79	295.41	242.45	119.64	56.24	175.88	87.94
1966-67	521.50	410.65	415.58	402.13	398.73	400.37	376.43	340.83	378.50	319.68	305.08	259.37	118.63	61.44	180.12	91.06
1967-68	534.00	411.05	420.83	407.27	403.90	405.63	385.43	374.59	353.30	348.14	278.03	267.86	126.96	60.94	187.90	93.95
1968-69	540.50	420.90	421.24	412.41	409.06	410.89	390.54	383.59	388.30	324.97	302.78	244.11	131.12	65.19	196.31	98.15
1969-70		426.02	431.34	412.81	414.22	416.14	395.60	388.63	397.63	357.16	282.63	265.84	119.49	67.33	186.82	93.41
1970-71			436.59	422.71	414.63	421.39	400.66	393.66	402.85	365.74	310.62	248.15	130.13	61.36	191.49	95.74
1971-72				427.86	424.57	421.80	405.71	398.70	408.07	370.54	318.08	272.72	121.47	66.32	188.29	94.14
1972-73					429.74	431.92	406.11	403.72	413.29	375.34	322.26	279.27	133.50	62.37	195.87	97.93
1973-74						437.17	415.85	404.12	418.50	380.14	320.43	282.94	136.70	68.55	205.25	102.62
1974-75							420.91	413.81	418.91	384.94	330.61	286.60	138.50	70.20	208.70	104.35
1975-76								418.85	423.96	385.31	334.73	290.28	140.29	71.12	211.41	105.70
1976-77									434.19	394.56	335.10	293.94	142.09	72.04	214.13	107.06
1977-78										399.36	343.15	294.22	143.88	72.96	216.84	108.42
1978-79											347.32	301.29	144.02	73.88	217.90	108.95
1979-80												304.95	147.48	73.95	221.43	110.71

*Projections are based upon the 1955-56--1961-62 enrollments from the Centerville, Del Rey, Fairmont, Granville, Sanger, and Tivy Valley Elementary Schools and the Sanger High School District.

TABLE XXIII*

PRESENT STATUS PROJECTIONS 1963-1980
FOR THE SIERRA UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

Year	Enrollment by Grade														Total Gr.	½ T. Gr.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	13 & 14	13 & 14
1955-56	119	117	135	127	117	107	124	122	105	116	99	66				
1956-57	160	151	140	144	122	120	116	124	120	106	107	88				
1957-58	155	169	159	153	151	134	121	111	122	136	99	95	43.24			
1958-59	199	189	180	180	168	173	169	123	132	145	129	98	46.96	22.20	69.16	34.58
1959-60	179	179	162	190	171	155	169	163	124	121	135	118				
1960-61	155	168	155	158	174	168	170	158	168	123	104	109				
1961-62	160	161	161	154	164	169	175	154	162	160	115	93				
T1	997	973	931	952	903	857	869	801	771	747	673	574				
T2	1008	1017	957	979	950	919	920	833	828	791	689	601				
Ratio	102.01	98.36	105.16	99.79	101.77	107.35	95.86	103.37	102.59	92.24	89.30	48.95	51.35			
1961-62	160	161	161	154	164	169	175	154	162	160	115	93				
1962-63	161.60	163.22	158.36	169.31	153.68	166.90	181.42	167.76	159.19	166.20	147.58	102.70	45.52			
1963-64	163.20	164.86	160.54	166.53	168.95	156.40	179.17	173.91	173.41	163.31	153.30	131.79	50.27	23.37	73.64	36.82
1964-65	164.80	166.48	162.16	168.82	166.18	171.94	167.90	171.75	179.77	177.80	150.64	136.90	64.51	25.81	90.32	46.16
1965-66	166.40	168.11	163.75	170.53	168.47	169.12	184.58	160.95	177.54	184.43	164.09	134.52	67.01	33.13	100.14	51.07
1966-67	168.00	169.74	165.35	172.20	170.17	171.45	181.55	176.94	166.37	182.14	170.12	146.53	65.85	34.41	100.26	51.13
1967-68	169.60	171.38	166.96	173.88	171.84	173.18	184.05	178.03	182.90	170.68	168.01	151.92	71.73	33.81	105.54	52.77
1968-69	171.20	173.01	168.57	175.58	173.51	174.88	185.91	176.43	179.89	187.64	157.44	150.03	74.36	36.83	111.19	55.59
1969-70		174.64	170.17	177.27	175.21	176.58	187.73	178.21	182.38	184.55	173.08	140.59	73.44	38.18	111.62	55.81
1970-71			171.78	178.95	176.90	178.31	189.56	179.96	184.22	187.10	170.23	154.56	69.82	37.71	106.53	53.26
1971-72				180.64	178.57	180.03	191.42	181.71	186.02	188.99	172.58	152.02	75.66	35.34	111.00	55.50
1972-73					180.26	181.73	193.26	183.50	187.83	190.84	174.32	154.11	74.41	38.85	113.26	56.63
1973-74						183.45	195.09	185.26	189.68	192.69	176.03	155.67	75.44	38.21	113.65	56.82
1974-75							196.93	187.01	191.50	194.59	177.74	157.19	76.20	38.74	114.94	57.47
1975-76								188.78	193.31	196.46	179.49	158.72	76.94	39.13	116.07	58.03
1976-77									195.14	198.32	181.21	160.28	77.69	39.51	117.20	58.60
1977-78										200.19	182.93	161.82	78.46	39.89	118.35	59.17
1978-79											184.65	163.37	79.21	40.29	119.50	59.75
1979-80												164.89	79.97	40.67	120.64	60.32

*Projections are based upon the 1955-56--1961-62 enrollments from the Ahwahnee, Auberry, Bass Lake, Big Creek, Chawanakee, Friant, North Fork, Oakhurst, Pine Ridge, Sierra, Coarsegold, and Cunningham Elementary Schools and the Sierra Union High School District.

TABLE XXIV*

PRESENT STATUS PROJECTIONS 1963-1980
FOR THE CHOWCHILLA UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

Year	Enrollment by Grade														Total Gr.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	13 & 14
1955-56	236	205	203	205	196	213	191	194	235	165	170	109			
1956-57	224	227	205	204	192	216	209	196	254	166	134	143			
1957-58	198	234	206	206	211	206	205	209	217	167	149	130	70.16		
1958-59	228	201	240	228	219	230	230	233	239	197	165	123	64.10	36.02	100.12
1959-60	215	200	206	245	226	220	226	214	218	217	167	142			
1960-61	216	197	202	201	201	215	214	223	193	197	180	130			
1961-62	194	208	198	249	188	220	223	219	216	188	170	151			
T1	1317	1264	1262	1289	1245	1300	1275	1269	1356	1109	965	777			
T2	1275	1267	1257	1333	1237	1307	1307	1294	1337	1320	965	819			
Ratio	96.20	99.45	105.63	95.97	104.98	100.54	101.49	105.36	97.35	87.01	84.87	48.95	51.35		
1961-62	194	208	198	249	188	220	223	219	216	188	170				
1962-63	194	186.63	206.85	209.15	238.97	197.36	221.19	226.32	230.74	210.28	163.58	144.28			
1963-64	194	186.63	185.60	218.51	200.72	250.87	198.43	224.49	238.45	224.63	182.96	138.83	70.63		
1964-65	194	186.63	185.60	196.05	209.70	210.72	252.22	201.39	236.52	232.13	195.45	155.28	67.96	36.27	104.23
1965-66	194	186.63	185.60	196.05	188.15	220.14	211.86	255.98	212.18	230.25	201.98	165.88	76.00	34.90	110.90
1966-67	194	186.63	185.60	196.05	188.15	197.52	221.33	215.02	269.70	206.56	200.34	171.42	81.20	39.03	120.23
1967-68	194	186.63	185.60	196.05	188.15	197.52	198.58	224.63	226.55	262.55	179.73	170.03	83.91	41.70	125.61
1968-69	194	186.63	185.60	196.05	188.15	197.52	198.58	201.54	236.67	220.55	228.44	152.54	83.23	43.89	126.32
1969-70		186.63	185.60	196.05	188.15	197.52	198.58	201.54	212.34	230.40	191.90	193.88	74.67	42.74	117.41
1970-71			185.60	196.05	188.15	197.52	198.58	201.54	212.34	206.71	200.47	162.87	94.90	38.34	133.24
1971-72				196.05	188.15	197.52	198.58	201.54	212.34	206.71	179.86	170.14	79.72	48.73	128.45
1972-73					188.15	197.52	198.58	201.54	212.34	206.71	179.86	152.65	83.28	40.94	124.22
1973-74						197.52	198.58	201.54	212.34	206.71	179.86	152.65	74.72	42.76	117.48
1974-75							198.58	201.54	212.34	206.71	179.86	152.65	74.72	38.37	113.09
1975-76								201.54	212.34	206.71	179.86	152.65	74.72	38.37	113.09
1976-77									212.34	206.71	179.86	152.65	74.72	38.37	113.09
1977-78										206.71	179.86	152.65	74.72	38.37	113.09
1978-79											179.86	152.65	74.72	38.37	113.09
1979-80												152.65	74.72	38.37	113.09

*Projections are based upon the 1955-56--1961-62 enrollments from the Alview, Chowchilla, Dairyland, and Fairmead Elementary Schools and the Chowchilla Union High School District.

TABLE XXV*

PRESENT STATUS PROJECTIONS 1963-1980
FOR THE DOS PALOS HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

Year	Enrollment by Grade														Total Gr.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	13 & 14
1955-56	428	371	323	316	333	320	324	304	287	216	183	133			
1956-57	447	368	339	315	312	308	311	284	273	226	152	151			
1957-58	406	381	372	331	319	291	313	304	289	246	184	142	73.91		
1958-59	418	355	369	360	343	312	287	299	296	216	190	158	69.97	37.95	107.92
1959-60	459	357	350	407	368	306	287	283	273	207	185	156			
1960-61	485	381	327	335	364	369	344	297	269	228	195	158			
1961-62	483	400	345	336	315	359	370	334	283	231	190	178			
T1	2643	2213	2080	2064	2039	1906	1866	1771	1687	1339	1089	898			
T2	2698	2242	2102	2084	2021	1945	1912	1801	1683	1354	1096	943			
Ratio	84.83	94.98	100.19	97.92	95.39	100.31	96.52	95.03	80.26	81.85	86.59	48.95	51.35		
1961-62	483	400	345	336	315	359	370	334	283	231	190	178			
1962-63	492.10	409.73	379.92	345.66	329.01	300.48	360.11	357.12	317.40	227.14	189.07	164.52	87.13		
1963-64	501.20	417.45	389.16	380.64	338.47	313.84	301.41	347.58	375.08	254.75	185.91	163.72	80.53	44.74	125.27
1964-65	510.30	425.17	396.49	389.90	372.72	322.87	314.81	290.92	330.31	301.04	208.51	160.98	80.14	41.35	121.49
1965-66	519.40	432.89	403.83	397.24	381.79	355.54	323.87	303.85	276.46	265.11	246.40	180.55	78.80	41.15	119.95
1966-67	528.50	440.61	411.16	404.60	388.98	364.19	356.64	312.60	288.75	221.89	216.99	213.36	88.38	40.46	128.84
1967-68	537.60	448.33	418.49	411.94	396.18	371.05	365.32	344.23	297.06	231.75	181.62	187.89	104.44	45.38	149.82
1968-69	546.70	456.05	425.82	419.29	403.37	377.92	372.20	352.61	327.12	238.42	189.69	157.26	91.97	53.63	145.60
1969-70		463.77	433.16	426.63	410.57	384.77	379.09	359.25	335.09	262.55	195.15	164.25	76.98	47.23	124.21
1970-71			440.49	433.98	417.76	391.64	385.96	365.90	341.40	268.94	214.90	168.98	80.40	39.53	119.93
1971-72				441.33	424.95	398.50	392.85	372.53	347.71	274.01	220.13	186.08	82.72	41.29	124.01
1972-73					432.15	405.36	399.74	379.18	354.02	279.07	224.28	190.61	91.09	42.48	133.57
1973-74						412.23	406.62	385.83	360.33	284.14	228.42	194.20	93.30	46.77	140.07
1974-75							413.51	392.47	366.65	289.20	232.57	197.79	95.06	47.91	142.97
1975-76								399.12	372.96	294.27	236.71	201.38	96.82	48.79	145.61
1976-77									379.28	299.34	240.86	204.97	98.58	49.72	148.30
1977-78										304.41	245.01	208.56	100.33	50.76	151.09
1978-79											249.16	212.15	102.09	51.52	153.61
1979-80												215.75	103.85	52.42	156.27

*Projections are based upon the 1955-56--1961-62 enrollments from the Bryant, George-Christian, Firebaugh, Las Deltas, Oro Loma, Dos Palos Elementary Schools and the Dos Palos High School District.

TABLE XXVI*

PRESENT STATUS PROJECTIONS 1963-1980
FOR THE MADERA HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

Year	Enrollment by Grade														Total Gr.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	13 & 14
1955-56	613	630	568	558	534	549	493	490	430	351	310	242			
1956-57	653	594	618	564	562	548	548	495	468	392	297	270			
1957-58	686	598	577	614	568	552	575	531	489	413	331	265	132.16		
1958-59	716	681	573	603	623	572	578	515	530	463	375	279	130.18	67.86	198.04
1959-60	743	628	655	522	587	617	552	553	541	459	386	283			
1960-61	743	661	621	628	528	611	649	557	564	496	395	346			
1961-62	716	637	641	588	620	521	608	592	540	514	431	334			
T1	4154	3792	3612	3489	3402	3449	3395	3141	3022	2574	2094	1685			
T2	4257	3799	3685	3519	3488	3421	3510	3243	3132	2737	2215	1777			
Ratio	91.45	97.18	97.43	99.97	100.56	101.77	95.52	99.71	90.57	86.05	84.86	48.95	51.35		
1961-62	716	637	641	588	620	521	608	592	540	514	431	334			
1962-63	727.10	654.78	619.04	624.53	587.82	623.47	530.22	580.76	590.28	489.08	442.30	365.75	163.49		
1963-64	744.20	664.93	636.32	603.13	624.34	591.11	634.51	506.47	579.08	534.62	420.85	375.34	179.03	83.95	262.98
1964-65	761.30	680.57	646.18	619.97	602.95	627.84	601.57	606.08	505.00	524.47	460.04	357.13	183.73	91.93	275.66
1965-66	778.40	696.22	661.38	629.57	619.78	606.33	638.95	574.62	604.32	457.38	451.31	390.39	174.82	94.35	269.17
1966-67	795.50	711.85	676.59	644.38	629.38	623.25	617.06	610.33	572.95	547.33	393.58	382.98	191.10	89.77	280.87
1967-68	812.60	727.49	691.78	659.20	644.19	632.90	634.28	589.42	608.56	518.92	470.98	333.99	187.47	98.13	285.60
1968-69	829.70	743.12	706.97	674.00	659.00	647.80	644.10	605.86	587.71	551.17	446.53	399.67	163.49	96.27	259.76
1969-70		758.76	722.16	688.80	673.80	662.69	659.27	615.24	604.10	532.29	474.28	378.93	195.64	83.95	279.59
1970-71			737.36	703.60	688.59	677.57	674.42	629.73	613.46	547.13	458.04	402.47	185.49	100.46	285.95
1971-72				718.41	703.39	692.45	689.56	644.21	627.90	555.61	470.81	388.69	197.10	95.25	292.35
1972-73					718.19	707.33	704.71	658.67	642.34	568.69	478.10	399.53	190.26	101.21	291.47
1973-74						722.21	719.85	673.14	656.76	581.77	489.36	405.72	195.57	97.70	293.27
1974-75							734.99	687.60	671.19	594.83	500.61	415.27	198.60	100.43	299.03
1975-76								702.06	685.61	607.90	511.85	424.82	203.27	101.98	305.25
1976-77									700.02	620.96	523.10	434.36	207.95	104.38	312.33
1977-78										634.01	534.34	443.90	212.62	106.78	319.40
1978-79											545.57	453.44	217.29	109.18	326.47
1979-80												462.97	221.96	111.58	333.54

*Projections are based upon the 1955-56--1961-62 enrollments from the Alpha, Berenda, Dixieland, Eastin-Arcola, Howard, LaVinna, Madera, Ripperdan, Spring Valley, and Webster Elementary Schools and the Madera High School District.

TABLE XXVII*

PRESENT STATUS PROJECTIONS 1963-1980 FOR THE CARUTHERS HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

Year	Enrollment by Grade														Total Gr.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	13 & 14
1955-56	150	156	138	142	129	136	139	133	111	90	93	59			
1956-57	135	149	144	179	160	130	140	143	128	97	82	74			
1957-58	167	131	154	157	146	171	128	133	132	110	74	70	36.22		
1958-59	181	162	148	153	146	157	157	123	118	120	94	57	34.26	18.59	52.85
1959-60	188	162	147	128	128	185	147	146	95	111	99	75			
1960-61	179	151	161	138	138	162	138	140	124	92	95	77			
1961-62	166	165	155	157	135	157	137	157	133	109	77	81			
T1	1000	911	892	897	847	941	849	818	708	620	537	412			
T2	1016	920	909	912	853	962	847	842	730	639	521	434			
Ratio	92.00	99.78	102.24	95.09	109.33	90.01	99.18	89.24	90.25	84.03	80.82	48.95	51.35		
1961-62	166	165	155	157	135	157	137	157	133	109	77	81			
1962-63	168.66	152.72	164.64	158.47	149.29	147.60	141.32	135.88	140.11	120.03	91.59	62.23	39.65		
1963-64	171.32	155.17	152.38	168.33	150.69	163.22	132.85	140.16	121.26	126.45	100.86	74.02	30.46	20.36	50.82
1964-65	173.98	157.61	154.83	155.79	160.06	164.75	146.91	131.76	125.08	109.44	106.26	81.52	36.23	15.64	51.87
1965-66	176.64	160.06	157.26	158.30	148.14	174.99	148.29	145.71	117.58	112.88	91.96	85.88	39.90	18.61	58.51
1966-67	179.30	162.51	159.71	160.78	150.53	161.96	157.51	147.07	130.03	106.12	94.85	74.32	42.04	20.49	62.53
1967-68	181.96	164.96	162.15	163.29	152.89	164.57	145.78	156.22	131.25	117.35	89.17	76.66	36.38	21.59	57.97
1968-69	184.62	167.40	164.60	165.78	155.27	167.15	148.13	144.58	139.41	118.45	98.61	72.07	37.53	18.68	56.21
1969-70		169.85	167.03	168.29	157.64	169.76	150.45	146.92	129.02	125.82	99.53	79.70	35.28	19.27	54.55
1970-71			169.48	170.77	160.03	172.35	152.80	149.22	131.11	116.44	105.73	80.44	39.01	18.12	57.13
1971-72				173.28	162.39	174.96	155.13	151.55	133.16	118.33	97.84	85.45	39.38	20.03	59.41
1972-73					164.77	177.54	157.48	153.86	135.24	120.13	99.43	79.07	41.83	20.22	62.05
1973-74						180.14	159.80	156.19	137.30	122.05	100.99	80.36	38.70	21.48	60.18
1974-75							162.14	158.49	139.38	123.91	102.56	81.62	39.34	19.87	59.21
1975-76								160.81	141.44	125.79	104.12	82.89	39.95	20.20	60.15
1976-77									143.51	127.65	105.70	84.15	40.57	20.51	61.08
1977-78										129.52	107.26	85.43	41.19	20.83	62.02
1978-79											108.84	86.69	41.82	21.15	62.97
1979-80												87.96	42.43	21.47	63.90

*Projections are based upon the 1955-56--1961-62 enrollments from the Alvina, Caruthers, Monroe, and Raisin City Elementary Schools and the Caruthers High School District.

TABLE XXVIII*

PRESENT STATUS PROJECTIONS 1963-1980
FOR THE DINUBA HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

Year	Enrollment by Grade														Total Gr.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	13 & 14
1955-56	226	216	204	170	149	188	161	164	180	173	156	117			
1956-57	228	243	213	199	182	171	197	161	162	176	160	134			
1957-58	240	219	219	206	189	168	157	194	146	146	163	147	65.59		
1958-59	264	230	200	205	213	200	181	164	193	154	136	144	71.95	33.68	105.63
1959-60	254	228	204	202	207	214	206	196	165	185	140	125			
1960-61	281	226	232	202	199	204	217	245	209	172	135	164			
1961-62	286	233	194	256	222	217	240	244	181	153	172	124			
T1	1493	1362	1272	1184	1136	1145	1119	1124	1055	1006	890	831			
T2	1553	1379	1262	1270	1212	1174	1198	1204	1056	986	906	838			
Ratio	92.36	92.66	99.84	102.36	103.34	104.63	107.60	93.95	93.46	90.05	94.16	48.95	51.35		
1961-62	286	233	194	256	222	217	240	244	181	153	172	124			
1962-63	296	264.15	215.82	193.69	262.04	229.41	227.04	258.24	229.23	169.16	137.77	161.95	60.69		
1963-64	306	273.39	244.76	215.47	198.26	270.79	240.03	244.29	242.61	214.23	152.32	129.72	79.27	31.16	110.43
1964-65	316	282.62	253.32	244.36	220.55	204.88	283.32	258.27	229.51	226.74	192.91	143.42	63.49	40.70	104.19
1965-66	326	291.85	261.88	252.91	250.13	227.91	211.36	304.85	242.64	214.50	204.17	181.64	70.20	32.60	102.80
1966-67	336	301.09	270.42	261.46	258.88	258.48	238.46	230.65	286.40	226.77	193.16	192.24	88.91	36.04	124.95
1967-68	346	310.33	278.99	269.99	267.63	267.52	270.44	256.58	216.69	267.66	204.21	181.88	94.10	45.65	139.75
1968-69		319.56	287.55	278.54	276.36	276.57	279.90	290.99	241.05	202.51	241.02	192.28	89.03	48.32	137.35
1969-70			296.10	287.08	285.11	285.59	289.37	301.17	273.38	225.28	182.36	226.94	94.12	45.71	139.83
1970-71				295.62	293.85	294.63	298.31	311.36	282.95	255.50	202.86	171.71	111.08	48.33	159.41
1971-72					302.60	303.66	308.27	321.51	292.52	264.44	230.07	191.01	84.05	57.03	141.08
1972-73						312.71	317.71	331.70	302.06	273.39	238.13	216.63	93.50	43.15	136.65
1973-74							327.18	341.85	311.63	282.30	246.19	224.22	106.04	48.01	154.05
1974-75								352.04	321.17	291.25	254.21	231.81	109.75	54.45	164.20
1975-76									330.74	300.16	262.27	239.36	113.47	56.35	169.82
1976-77										309.11	270.29	246.95	117.16	58.26	175.42
1977-78											278.35	254.50	120.88	60.16	181.04
1978-79												262.09	124.57	62.07	186.64
1979-80													128.29	63.96	192.25

*Projections are based upon the 1955-56--1961-62 enrollments from the Dinuba, Grand View and Monson-Sultana Elementary Schools and the Dinuba High School District.

TABLE XXIX*

PRESENT STATUS PROJECTIONS 1963-1980
FOR THE KINGSBURG JOINT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

Year	Enrollment by Grade														Total Gr.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	13 & 14
1955-56	191	207	182	179	182	199	190	176	113	131	95	82			
1956-57	215	182	197	189	186	181	198	189	145	114	119	94			
1957-58	236	205	191	190	182	198	166	190	177	145	100	113	46.01		
1958-59	239	235	202	179	191	183	200	176	151	150	142	100	55.31	23.62	78.93
1959-60	239	227	217	207	175	209	175	191	144	147	145	131			
1960-61	252	211	200	205	201	160	203	168	164	141	132	129			
1961-62	246	236	209	215	216	203	182	201	165	163	138	125			
T1	1272	1267	1189	1149	1117	1130	1132	1090	899	823	733	649			
T2	1327	1296	1216	1185	1151	1134	1124	1115	946	860	776	692			
Ratio	101.87	95.97	99.66	100.17	101.52	99.47	98.50	86.79	95.66	93.72	94.41	48.95	51.35		
1961-62	246	236	209	215	216	203	182	201	165	163	138	125			
1962-63	255.10	250.60	226.49	208.29	215.37	219.28	201.92	179.27	174.45	157.84	152.76	130.29	61.19		
1963-64	264.20	259.87	240.50	225.72	208.64	218.64	218.12	198.89	155.59	166.38	147.93	144.22	63.78	31.42	95.20
1964-65	273.30	269.14	249.40	239.68	226.10	211.81	217.48	214.85	172.62	148.84	156.40	139.66	70.60	32.75	103.35
1965-66	282.40	278.41	258.29	248.55	240.09	229.54	210.69	214.22	186.47	165.13	139.49	147.66	68.36	36.25	104.61
1966-67	291.50	287.68	267.19	257.41	248.73	243.74	228.32	207.53	185.92	178.38	154.76	131.69	72.28	35.10	107.38
1967-68	300.60	296.95	276.09	266.28	257.35	252.51	242.45	224.90	180.12	177.35	167.13	146.11	64.46	37.12	101.58
1968-69	309.70	306.22	284.98	275.15	266.73	261.77	251.17	238.81	195.19	172.30	166.68	157.83	71.52	33.10	104.62
1969-70		315.18	293.88	284.01	275.62	270.73	260.38	247.40	207.26	186.72	161.48	157.36	77.26	36.73	113.99
1970-71			302.48	292.88	284.50	279.81	269.34	256.47	214.72	198.26	174.99	152.45	77.03	39.67	116.70
1971-72				301.45	293.38	288.82	278.33	265.30	222.59	205.40	185.81	165.21	74.62	39.55	114.17
1972-73					301.96	297.84	287.29	274.16	230.25	212.93	192.50	175.42	80.87	38.32	119.19
1973-74						306.55	296.26	282.98	237.94	220.26	199.56	181.74	85.87	41.53	127.40
1974-75							304.93	291.82	245.60	227.61	206.43	188.40	88.96	44.09	133.05
1975-76								300.36	253.27	234.94	213.32	194.89	92.22	45.68	137.90
1976-77									260.68	242.28	220.19	201.40	95.40	47.35	142.75
1977-78										249.37	227.06	207.88	98.59	48.99	147.58
1978-79											233.71	214.37	101.76	50.63	152.12
1979-80												220.65	104.93	52.25	157.18

*Projections are based upon the 1955-56--1961-62 enrollments from the Clay, Kingsburg, Kings River and Traver Elementary Schools and the Kingsburg Joint Union High School District.

TABLE XXX*

PRESENT STATUS PROJECTIONS 1963-1980
FOR THE LATON JOINT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

Year	Enrollment by Grade														Total Gr.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	13 & 14
1955-56	92	89	74	76	76	79	77	86	34	51	55	52			
1956-57	87	97	89	81	80	73	83	78	89	72	47	54			
1957-58	80	79	86	83	84	78	69	84	66	77	69	38	26.43		
1958-59	99	77	86	90	81	79	79	75	78	64	71	60	18.60	13.57	32.17
1959-60	97	90	75	81	92	86	85	83	74	76	57	62			
1960-61	84	88	93	68	73	91	78	74	76	62	70	59			
1961-62	88	90	90	88	74	82	80	84	87	71	55	59			
T1	539	520	503	479	486	486	471	480	467	402	369	325			
T2	535	521	519	491	484	489	474	478	470	422	369	332			
Ratio	96.66	99.81	97.61	101.04	100.62	97.53	101.49	97.92	90.36	91.79	89.97	48.95	51.35		
1961-62	88	90	90	88	74	82	80	84	87	71	55	59			
1962-63	88	85.06	89.83	87.85	88.92	74.46	79.97	81.19	82.25	78.61	65.17	49.18	28.88		
1963-64	88	85.06	84.90	87.68	88.76	89.47	72.62	81.16	79.50	74.32	72.16	58.63	24.22	14.83	39.05
1964-65	88	85.06	84.90	82.87	88.59	89.31	87.26	73.70	79.47	71.84	68.22	64.92	28.70	12.44	41.14
1965-66	88	85.06	84.90	82.87	83.73	89.14	87.10	88.56	72.17	71.81	65.94	61.38	31.78	14.74	46.52
1966-67	88	85.06	84.90	82.87	83.73	84.25	86.94	88.40	86.72	65.21	65.91	59.33	30.05	16.32	46.37
1967-68	88	85.06	84.90	82.87	83.73	84.25	82.17	88.24	86.56	78.36	59.36	59.30	29.04	15.43	44.47
1968-69	88	85.06	84.90	82.87	83.73	84.25	82.17	83.39	86.40	78.22	71.93	53.86	29.03	14.91	43.94
1969-70		85.06	84.90	82.87	83.73	84.25	82.17	83.39	81.66	78.07	71.80	64.72	26.36	14.91	41.27
1970-71			84.90	82.87	83.73	84.25	82.17	83.39	81.66	73.79	71.66	64.60	31.68	13.54	45.22
1971-72				82.87	83.73	84.25	82.17	83.39	81.66	73.79	67.73	64.47	31.62	16.27	47.89
1972-73					83.73	84.25	82.17	83.39	81.66	73.79	67.73	60.94	31.56	16.24	47.80
1973-74						84.25	82.17	83.39	81.66	73.79	67.73	60.94	29.83	16.21	46.04
1974-75							82.17	83.39	81.66	73.79	67.73	60.94	29.83	15.32	45.15
1975-76								83.39	81.66	73.79	67.73	60.94	29.83	15.32	45.15
1976-77									81.66	73.79	67.73	60.94	29.83	15.32	45.15
1977-78										73.79	67.73	60.94	29.83	15.32	45.15
1978-79											67.73	60.94	29.83	15.32	45.15
1979-80												60.94	29.83	15.32	45.15

*Projections are based upon the 1955-56--1961-62 enrollments from the Conejo, Hardwick, Laguna and Laton Elementary Schools and the Laton High School District.

TABLE XXXI*

PRESENT STATUS PROJECTIONS 1963-1980
FOR THE PARLIER HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

Year	Enrollment by Grade														Total Gr.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	13 & 14
1955-56	139	104	84	88	74	67	55	67	51	48	53	31			
1956-57	136	98	102	93	87	78	74	54	62	42	48	48			
1957-58	139	118	106	112	85	90	68	69	46	55	35	40	23.49		
1958-59	161	118	115	101	114	96	80	56	51	43	42	29	19.58	12.06	31.64
1959-60	145	140	128	122	109	129	95	74	58	43	34	33			
1960-61	168	123	150	127	132	114	131	76	67	45	36	35			
1961-62	154	142	114	136	124	130	105	121	65	49	35	27			
T1	888	701	685	643	601	574	503	396	335	276	243	216			
T2	903	739	715	691	651	637	553	450	349	277	230	212			
Ratio	83.22	102.00	100.38	101.24	105.99	96.34	89.46	88.13	82.69	83.33	85.48	48.95	51.35		
1961-62	154	142	114	136	124	138	105	121	65	49	35	27			
1962-63	154.50	128.16	144.84	115.00	137.69	131.43	132.95	93.93	106.64	53.75	40.83	29.92	13.22		
1963-64	155.00	128.57	130.72	146.11	116.43	145.94	126.62	118.94	82.78	88.18	44.79	34.90	14.65	6.79	21.44
1964-65	156.50	128.99	131.14	131.87	147.92	123.40	140.60	113.27	104.82	68.45	73.48	38.29	17.08	7.52	24.60
1965-66	157.00	130.24	131.57	132.29	133.51	156.78	118.88	125.78	99.32	86.68	57.04	62.81	18.74	8.77	27.51
1966-67	157.50	130.66	132.84	132.73	133.93	141.51	151.04	106.35	110.85	82.54	72.23	48.76	30.75	9.62	40.37
1967-68	158.00	131.07	133.27	134.01	134.38	141.95	136.33	135.12	93.73	91.66	63.78	61.74	23.87	15.79	39.66
1968-69	159.50	131.49	133.69	134.44	135.67	142.43	136.75	121.96	119.08	77.51	76.38	58.79	30.22	12.26	42.48
1969-70		132.74	134.12	134.87	136.11	143.80	137.22	122.34	107.48	98.47	64.59	65.29	28.78	15.52	44.30
1970-71			135.39	135.30	136.54	144.26	138.54	122.75	107.82	88.88	82.06	55.21	31.96	14.78	46.74
1971-72				136.58	136.98	144.72	138.98	123.94	108.19	89.16	74.06	70.14	27.03	16.41	43.44
1972-73					138.27	145.19	139.42	124.33	109.23	89.46	74.30	63.31	34.33	13.88	48.21
1973-74						146.55	139.88	124.73	109.57	90.32	74.55	63.51	30.99	17.63	48.62
1974-75							141.19	125.14	109.92	90.60	75.26	63.73	31.09	15.91	47.00
1975-76								126.31	110.29	90.89	75.50	64.33	31.20	15.96	47.16
1976-77									111.32	91.20	75.74	64.54	31.49	16.02	47.51
1977-78										92.05	76.00	64.74	31.60	16.17	47.77
1978-79											76.71	64.96	31.70	16.23	47.93
1979-80												65.57	31.80	16.28	48.08

*Projections are based upon the 1955-56--1961-62 enrollments from the Parlier Unified Elementary School and the Parlier Unified High School.

TABLE XXXII*

PRESENT STATUS PROJECTIONS 1963-1980
FOR THE REEDLEY HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

Year	Enrollment by Grade														Total Gr.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	13 & 14
1955-56	401	325	320	293	266	303	288	298	220	249	198	169			
1956-57	391	391	315	341	285	273	294	288	241	212	219	171			
1957-58	381	325	369	308	334	286	276	289	263	238	201	185	83.70		
1958-59	402	351	359	365	332	341	296	297	288	259	217	165	90.55	42.97	133.52
1959-60	396	385	338	363	379	341	336	303	277	256	218	194			
1960-61	466	379	412	359	372	385	347	350	299	256	238	186			
1961-62	512	429	396	420	347	374	379	347	318	275	246	211			
T1	2437	2156	2113	2029	1968	1929	1837	1825	1588	1470	1291	1070			
T2	2548	2260	2189	2156	2049	2000	1928	1874	1686	1496	1339	1112			
Ratio	92.74	101.53	102.04	100.99	101.63	99.95	102.01	92.38	94.21	91.09	86.13	48.95	51.35		
1961-62	512	429	396	420	347	374	379	347	318	275	246	211			
1962-63	528.50	474.83	435.56	404.08	424.16	352.66	373.81	386.62	320.56	299.59	250.50	211.88	103.28		
1963-64	545.00	490.13	482.09	444.45	408.08	431.07	352.48	381.32	357.16	301.10	272.90	215.76	103.72	53.03	156.75
1964-65	561.50	500.80	497.63	491.92	448.85	414.73	430.85	359.56	352.26	336.48	274.27	235.05	105.61	53.26	158.87
1965-66	578.00	520.74	508.46	507.78	496.79	456.17	414.52	439.51	332.16	331.86	306.50	236.23	115.06	54.23	169.29
1966-67	594.50	536.04	528.71	518.83	512.81	504.89	455.94	422.85	406.02	312.93	302.29	263.99	115.63	59.08	174.71
1967-68	611.00	551.34	544.24	539.50	523.97	521.17	504.64	465.10	390.63	382.51	285.05	260.36	129.22	59.38	188.60
1968-69	627.50	566.64	559.78	555.34	544.84	532.51	520.91	514.78	429.66	368.01	348.43	245.51	127.45	66.35	193.80
1969-70		581.94	575.31	571.20	560.84	553.72	532.24	531.38	475.55	404.78	335.22	300.10	120.18	65.45	185.63
1970-71			590.84	587.05	576.85	569.98	553.44	542.94	490.89	448.02	368.71	288.72	146.90	61.71	208.61
1971-72				602.89	592.86	586.25	569.70	564.56	501.57	462.47	408.10	317.57	141.33	75.43	216.76
1972-73					608.86	602.52	585.96	581.15	521.54	472.53	421.26	351.50	155.45	72.57	228.02
1973-74						618.78	602.22	597.74	536.87	491.34	430.43	362.83	172.06	79.82	251.88
1974-75							618.47	614.32	552.19	505.79	447.56	370.73	177.61	88.35	265.96
1975-76								630.90	567.51	520.22	460.72	385.48	181.47	91.20	272.67
1976-77									582.83	534.65	473.87	396.82	188.69	93.18	281.87
1977-78										549.08	487.01	408.14	194.24	96.89	291.13
1978-79											500.16	419.46	199.78	99.74	299.52
1979-80												430.79	205.33	102.58	307.91

*Projections are based upon the 1955-56--1961-62 enrollments from the Alta Union, Dunlap, Great Western, Miramonte, Navalencia, Orange Cove, Reedley, Riverview, Smith Mountain, Squaw Valley, and Windsor Elementary Schools and the Reedley High School District.

TABLE XXXIII*

PRESENT STATUS PROJECTIONS 1963-1980 FOR THE SELMA HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

Year	Enrollment by Grade														Total Gr.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	13 & 14
1955-56	393	362	315	289	310	268	308	310	252	213	166	133			
1956-57	407	354	356	298	324	131	270	321	255	213	174	130			
1957-58	434	368	349	328	289	298	306	260	260	240	162	146	63.63		
1958-59	414	360	369	355	348	313	309	293	244	229	207	156	71.63	32.67	104.30
1959-60	453	392	344	360	343	350	319	306	255	212	201	166			
1960-61	452	375	386	359	339	356	334	308	269	228	183	184			
1961-62	401	395	384	362	331	238	246	332	291	226	188	150			
T1	2553	2211	2119	1989	2053	1716	1846	1798	1535	1335	1093	915			
T2	2561	2244	2188	2062	1974	1686	1784	1820	1574	1348	1115	932			
Ratio	87.90	98.96	97.31	99.25	82.12	103.96	98.59	87.54	87.82	83.52	85.27	48.95	51.35		
1961-62	401	395	384	362	331	238	246	332	291	226	188	150			
1962-63	402.30	352.48	390.89	373.67	359.29	271.82	247.42	242.53	290.63	255.56	188.76	160.31	73.43		
1963-64	403.60	353.62	348.81	380.38	370.87	212.93	282.58	243.93	212.31	255.23	213.44	160.96	78.47	37.71	116.18
1964-65	404.90	354.76	349.94	339.43	377.53	304.56	221.36	278.60	213.54	186.45	213.17	182.00	78.79	40.29	119.08
1965-66	406.20	355.91	351.07	340.53	336.88	310.03	316.62	218.24	243.89	187.53	155.72	181.77	89.09	40.46	129.55
1966-67	407.50	357.05	352.21	341.63	337.98	276.65	322.31	312.16	191.05	214.18	156.63	132.78	88.98	45.75	134.73
1967-68	408.80	358.19	353.34	342.74	339.07	277.55	287.61	317.77	273.26	167.78	178.88	133.56	65.00	45.69	110.69
1968-69	410.10	359.34	354.46	343.84	340.17	278.44	288.54	283.55	278.18	239.98	140.13	152.53	65.38	33.38	98.76
1969-70		360.48	355.60	344.93	341.26	279.35	289.47	284.47	248.22	244.30	200.43	119.49	74.66	33.57	108.23
1970-71			356.73	346.03	342.34	280.24	290.41	285.39	249.03	217.99	204.39	170.91	58.49	38.34	96.83
1971-72				347.13	343.43	281.13	291.34	286.32	249.83	218.70	182.07	174.28	83.66	30.03	113.69
1972-73					344.53	282.02	292.26	287.23	250.64	219.40	182.66	155.25	85.31	42.96	128.27
1973-74						282.93	293.19	288.14	251.44	220.11	183.24	155.75	75.99	43.81	119.80
1974-75							294.13	289.06	252.24	220.81	183.84	156.25	76.24	39.02	115.26
1975-76								289.98	253.04	221.52	184.42	156.76	76.48	39.15	115.63
1976-77									253.85	222.22	185.01	157.25	76.73	39.27	116.00
1977-78										222.93	185.60	157.76	76.97	39.40	116.37
1978-79											186.19	158.26	77.22	39.52	116.74
1979-80												158.76	77.47	39.65	117.12

*Projections are based upon the 1955-56--1961-62 enrollments from the Del Rey, Franklin, Indianola, Selma, and Terry Union Elementary Schools and the Selma High School District.